

Vol. XXVII.

APRIL, 1950.

No. 2

THE AUSTRALASIAN Catholic Record

FOR CLERGY
AND RELIGIOUS



*The Official Organ for communications issued by the
Apostolic Delegate to Australasia.*

Announcements

MSS., queries and books for review, should be addressed to the Editor, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

Queries relating to S. Scripture, Moral Theology, Canon Law, Liturgy, or any subject of professional interest, are cordially invited. Name and address, even if not intended for publication, must accompany all Queries.

Notice of change of address, and correspondence about missing and back numbers, should be addressed to the Manager, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: *Yearly, in advance, 15/-.*

Remittances should be sent to the Manager or the Diocesan Collector, either by postal order or cheque.

The clergy of each diocese are invited to appoint one of their number to collect and forward their annual subscriptions.

The following priests are acting as collectors and representatives for the *Australasian Catholic Record* in their respective dioceses:—

Archdiocese of Sydney—A.C.R. Staff.

Archdiocese of Perth—Rt. Rev. J. T. McMahon, M.A., Ph.D., South Perth, W.A.

Archdiocese of Wellington—Rev. J. L. Dunn, Wellington, N.Z.

Archdiocese of Adelaide—Rev. D. O'Connell, Murray Bridge, S.A.

Archdiocese of Brisbane—Rev. V. Carroll, Banyo, Q.

Archdiocese of Hobart—Rev. J. Wallis, Launceston, Tas.

Archdiocese of Canberra and Goulburn—Rev. J. Blakeney, P.P., Cobargo, N.S.W.

Diocese of Armidale—Rev. J. Healy, Armidale, N.S.W.

Diocese of Auckland—Rt. Rev. L. Buxton, D.C.L., M.A., Hamilton, N.Z.

Diocese of Ballarat—V. Rev. E. Glowrey, St. Arnaud, Vic.

Diocese of Bathurst—V. Rev. M. J. Dunne, B.A., Adm. Bathurst, N.S.W.

Diocese of Cairns—Rev. E. C. Clifford, O.S.A., Tully, Q.

Diocese of Christchurch—V. Rev. T. Liddy, Adm., Christchurch, N.Z.

Diocese of Darwin—Rev. W. Henschke, M.S.C., Darwin, N.T.

Diocese of Dunedin—Rev. A. Loughnan, Dunedin, N.Z.

Diocese of Geraldton—Rev. Bryan Gallagher, Ph.D., Three Springs, W.A.

Diocese of Lismore—V. Rev. T. Morris, P.P., Smithtown, N.S.W.

Diocese of Maitland—Rev. T. Cronin, Waratah, N.S.W.

Diocese of Port Augusta—Very Rev. W. P. Kain, Pekina, S.A.

Diocese of Rockhampton—V. Rev. P. J. Walsh, D.D., Adm., Rockhampton, Q.

Diocese of Sale—V. Rev. J. Fitzpatrick, Leongatha, Vic.

Diocese of Sandhurst—Rev. J. Hussey, Bright, Vic.

Diocese of Toowoomba—Rev. M. Mahon, Adm., Warwick, Q.

Diocese of Townsville—Very Rev. K. J. H. Kelly, D.D., Ayr, Q.

Diocese of Wagga—V. Rev. J. Larkins, P.P., Junee, N.S.W.

Diocese of Wilcannia-Forbes—Very Rev. Dean J. Sexton, V.F., Nyngan, N.S.W.

Editor: REV. T. VEECH,

Manager: REV. F. A. MECHAM,
St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

The Australasian Catholic Record

A Quarterly Publication under Ecclesiastical Sanction

"Pro Ecclesia Dei." St. Augustine.

Contents:

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS,

Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S. 97

Letter of H.H. Pope Pius XII to Cardinal Gilroy—Allocution to lawyers—Validity of baptism conferred in certain sects—Use of electro-phonic organs—Introduction of the cause of Bishop Verjus—Teaching of Sacred Music in seminaries.

SAINT THOMAS'S WORLD,

Rev. Cornelius Roberts, D.D., Ph.D. 106

BISHOP WILLSON, III,

Rt. Rev. John H. Cullen, P.P., V.G., B.A. 115

"CREATED ACTUATION BY THE UNCREATED ACT"

Rev. John P. Kenny, S.J. 130

Reflections on the theory of Father Maurice De La Taille, S.J.

MORAL THEOLOGY Very Rev. James Madden, D.D. 142

Members of legal profession and civil divorce—Burial of a well-disposed non-Catholic.

LITURGY Very Rev. James Madden, D.D. 154

Notes concerning the Church and its furnishings, III (Rev. R. F. Donohoe)—Mass without a server—Blessing of engagement ring—Questions concerning the Office—Holy Communion administered as Viaticum—Nuptial Blessing for converts—Sanctuary Bell—The Mass *pro populo*.

HOMILETICS Rev. Thomas Muldoon, D.D. 168

The Blessed Eucharist: Mystery of Faith.

NOTES 175

On the validity of the offering of the Mass by a priest separated from the Church.

BOOK REVIEWS 179

Evolution and Philosophy (Duggan); *De Unione sacerdotis cum Christo sacerdote et Victima* (Garrigou-Lagrange); *Questions and Answers, Vol. II* (Mahoney); *Rufinus of Aquileia* (Murphy); *Praelectiones Biblicae, Vetus Testamentum, I* (Simon-Prado); *The Eschatology of Saint Jerome* (O'Connell); *Knocknagow; or, the Homes of Tipperary* (Kieckham); *Doctor Communis; The Divine Crucible* (Mother Mary of St. Austin); *Justice for the Worker* (Beckett).

N.B.—Owing to Monsignor Carroll being abroad, the section on Canon Law is omitted from this number.

Nihil Obstat :

RICHARDUS COLLENDER

CENSOR DEPUTATUS.

Imprimatur :

✠ N.T. CARD. GILROY,

ARCHIEP. SYDNEYENSIS.

1a die, Aprilis, 1950.

Official Documents

Autograph Letter of His Holiness Pope Pius XII to His Eminence Cardinal Norman Gilroy, appointing him Papal Legate to the Plenary Council of the East Indies at Bangalore.

Dilecto Filio Nostro Normanno tit. Sanctorum Quattuor Coronatorum S.R.E. Presbytero Cardinali Gilroy Archiepiscopo Sydneyensi

PIUS PP. XII

Dilecte Fili Noster, Salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.

Jam plures abhinc annos necessitas Concilii Plenarii ineundi ad regimen Ecclesiae in amplissima Indiarum Orientalium regione feliciter confirmandum omnino persentiebatur et omnia studia et consilia inter sacrorum Antistites pluries conlata sunt ad perficiendum quod erat in votis; sed variae gravesque temporum rerumque difficultates prohibuere, quominus alacriter incepta ad suum exitum adducerentur. Nunc autem, postquam universa India, haud obstante gentium morumque et plagarum latitudinis diversitate, sui juris recens effecta est, hodierni Praesules maturitatem venisse censuerunt exoptati Concilii Plenarii concelebrandi. Multa sunt enim eaque magni ponderis in Episcoporum coetibus exagitanda, quorum expeditio rei catholicae felix incrementum afferre videtur, ut fideles Indiarum catholici aptioris beneque ordinati regiminis beneficia percipiant alique cives innumeri, nondum Ecclesiae verae participes, ad montem domus Domini praeparatum oculos animosque suos convertant. Campus quidem pastoralis industriae ad animarum salutem in Indiis omni ope tuendam, ad prosperitatem ordinis ipsius civilis fovendam latissime patet. Non modo enim fines plurium diocesium ac provinciarum ecclesiasticarum mutatis rerum condicionibus sunt accommodandi, verum etiam omnium quaedam promovenda tam clericorum quam laicorum in India conspiratio cum operum atque institutorum conjunctione, quae catholici nominis propagationem efficiat expeditiorem una cum virtutum christianarum cultu. Prospiciendum itaque erit ut indigeni cleri augeatur in dies copia ejusque doctrina eruditioque perficiatur, ut actio catholica laicorum congrua temporibus ratione aptius ordinetur, ut constitutio Catholicae Studiorum Universitatis apparetur, ut caritatis educationisque instituta roborentur et multiplicentur, ut religio catholica ope praesertim typographicae artis longe lateque evulgetur. Consilium autem Episcoporum, catholicae rei universae Indiae moderandae jam pridem praepositum, ex proximo

Concilio Plenario majorem procul dubio vim atque auctoritatem consequentur. Jam vero, cum de negotio tanti momenti tantaeque agatur utilitatis, peropportune in Codice juris canonici cautum est, ut Plenarium Concilium per Legatum Pontificium, qui eidem praesideat, ab ipsa Petri Cathedra primum capiat auspiciū et validum ad perficiendum opus incitamentum. Te igitur, Dilecte Fili Noster, qui romana purpura exornatus, praeclaræ Sydneyensis sedis gubernacula tenes, hisce Litteris Legatum Nostrum a Latere eligimus ac renuntiamus, ut, Nostram gerens personam, nomine Nostro Nostraque auctoritate Concilio Plenario, in Januarium mensem proximum in Bangalorenſi urbe cogendo, praesidis. Pro certo sane habemus, temet pro tua pietate ac prudentia perhonorificum munus esse executurum. Tibi praeterea facultatem largimur, ut, die constituta, Sacro pontificali ritu peracto, adstantibus fidelibus nomine Nostro Nostraque auctoritate benedicas, plenariam indulgentiam iisdem proponens, ad Ecclesiae praescripta lucrandam. Interea in auspiciū caelestium luminum munerumque atque in praecipuae caritatis Nostrae pignus, Apostolicam Benedictionem tibi, Dilecte Fili Noster, cunctis Praesulibus iisque universis, qui Concilio intererunt, effuso animo impertimus.

Datum ex Arce Gandulphi prope Romam, die VII mensis Novembris anno MDCCCCXXXIX Pontificatus Nostri undecimo.

PIUS PP. XII.

*

*

*

*

Translation.

To Our Beloved Son Norman Gilroy, Cardinal Priest of the Holy Roman Church of the title of the Four Crowned Martyrs, Archbishop of Sydney.

PIUS XII POPE

Our Beloved Son, Health and Apostolic Benediction.

For many years the holding of a Plenary Council in the East Indies has been an acknowledged need. Such a Council was felt to be required in order to establish more firmly the governmental organization of the Church in that vast part of the world. Consequently it was the desire of the Indian Bishops that it should take place, and all their efforts and common counsels were many times over set on realizing that desire. However, difficulties of various kinds, inherent in the grave circumstances of times and conditions, prevented the speedy preparation and celebration of a Plenary Council.

Now, at last, the time has arrived. The whole land of India, not-

withstanding diversities of race, and customs, and in spite of geographical distances, has become one independent country. It is no wonder, then, that its Prelates have considered that the time is ripe to celebrate the desired Plenary Council. Indeed, many important things need to be discussed at the meetings of the Bishops, in view of advancing the cause of Catholicism. The Catholic faithful of the Indies should now receive the benefits of a better and a more organized administration, and the other citizens of the new State—a vast population indeed, which has not yet come to enjoy the fellowship of the true Church—should have their eyes and souls turned more efficaciously to the mountain of the Lord prepared to attract them.

The field of pastoral effort in vigorously pursuing the salvation of souls in India and in fostering therewith the prosperity of civil order throughout the land is exceedingly wide. Not only do the boundaries of several dioceses and ecclesiastical provinces need readjustment in a changed condition of things, but also a great union of forces must be procured—both clerical and lay forces—arrayed in the concerted action of works and institutions, to propagate the Catholic name more speedily, and to make Christian virtue flower more happily.

Measures will therefore have to be taken that the native clergy may daily increase in numbers, with a corresponding excellence of preparation in learning and erudition. The Catholic Action of the laity will have to be better adapted to the times. The plan of a Catholic University of studies will have to be prepared. Charitable and educational institutions will have to be strengthened and multiplied; and a greater use must be made of the means of propagating the Catholic faith far and wide, especially through the printing press.

The Committee of Bishops long existing to moderate all Catholic movements throughout the whole of India will doubtless grow in efficacy and authority as a result of the Plenary Council.

The matter being one of such great importance and such great utility, the Code of Canon Law wisely provides that every Plenary Council should be presided over by a Papal Legate, and thus be inaugurated and stimulated in pursuing its programme by the Chair of Peter itself. Hence We choose you, Our Beloved Son, who are adorned with the Roman Purple, and by these Letters We appoint you Our Legate a Latere. Representing Our person you will preside in Our name, and with Our authority over the Plenary Council, which is to be held next January, in the city of Bangalore. We are certain that you

will carry out this most exalted office with the piety and prudence that characterize you. Besides, We grant you the faculty of imparting the Apostolic Blessing. On an appointed day, after solemn Pontifical Mass, you will in Our name and with Our authority bless the faithful present, according them a plenary indulgence to be gained on the usual conditions.

Meanwhile as a guerdon of heavenly lights and gifts, and as a pledge of Our special benevolence, We impart, with effusion of soul, to yourself, Our Beloved Son, to all the Prelates and to all who will take part in the Council, Our Apostolic Benediction.

Given from Castel Gandolfo, near Rome, on the seventh day of November, in the year 1949, the eleventh of Our Pontificate.

PIUS XII POPE.

*

*

*

*

Allocution.

The important Allocution given by the Holy Father to the members of the Union of Catholic lawyers of Italy on the 6th of November, 1949, is, unfortunately, beyond the capacity of our space. The nobility of the legal profession, its Roman and Christian attachments, the contrasts between the old Christianized legal heritage of Rome and modern juridical positivism are luminously set forth. The practical norms which follow this fine disquisition we give in full.

The Pope said to the lawyers:

"We take this occasion of your gathering here in Our presence to enlighten the conscience of Catholic jurists by the enunciation of some fundamental norms.

1) For every judicial sentence the principle holds that a judge cannot purely and simply throw the responsibility of his decision on the law and its makers. Without doubt, these bear the chief responsibility for the effects of the law itself. But the judge, who by his sentence applies it to a particular case, is co-cause, and therefore co-responsible for those effects.

2) A judge can never give a decision obliging someone to an act intrinsically immoral, that is to say, of its very nature opposed to the law of God or of the Church.

3) He cannot, in any case whatever, expressly recognize and approve an unjust law (which law, in any hypothesis, could never constitute the foundation of a judgment valid in conscience and before God). Therefore, he cannot pronounce a penal sentence which is

equivalent to such an approval of an unjust law. His responsibility here would be more serious, if his sentence were to cause public scandal.

4) All the same, not every application of an unjust law is equivalent to its recognition and approval. When this is so, a judge can—sometimes perhaps he must—let the unjust law take its course, if this is the only means of hindering a greater evil. He can inflict a penalty for the transgression of an unjust law, if the penalty is of such kind that he who has to bear it reasonably disposed to submit to it, in order to avoid that other evil, or in order to secure a good of much higher importance, or if the judge knows or can prudently suppose that such a sanction will be willingly accepted by the transgressor, for higher motives. In times of persecution priests and laymen have often allowed themselves to be condemned, without offering any resistance, even by Catholic magistrates, to fines and privations of personal liberty for the infringement of unjust laws, when in this way it was possible to keep for the people a good magistrature and to turn away from the Church and from the faithful still more formidable calamities.

Naturally, the greater gravity of the consequences of a judicial sentence will require a more important and a more general good to be upheld, or a correspondingly great evil to be avoided. There are, however, cases in which the idea of compensation through the attainment of higher goods or through the warding off of greater evils, cannot have application, as in a death sentence. In particular, a Catholic judge cannot pronounce, except for motives of great weight, a sentence of civil divorce (where such obtains) in the case of a matrimony valid before God and the Church. He must not forget that such a sentence in practice does not touch the civil effects alone, but really conduces to the error of regarding the actual bond as broken and the new as valid and obligatory”.

* * * *

Supreme S. Congregation of the Holy Office

Reply

on the validity of baptism conferred in certain sects.

The following doubt was submitted to this Supreme Sacred Congregation by some local Ordinaries of the United States of North America:

“Whether in making decisions in matrimonial causes, Baptism conferred in the sects of the Disciples of Christ, of Presbyterians, of Congregationalists, of Baptists, of Methodists, when necessary matter and

form have been used, is still to be presumed invalid on account of defect of the intention required in the minister—the intention of doing what the Church does or what Christ instituted; or is the baptism to be presumed valid, unless the contrary is proved in a particular case?

on Wednesday, 21 Dec., 1949

their Eminences the Cardinals entrusted with the safeguarding of faith and morals, having heard the opinion of the Consultors, ordered the following answers to be given to the above doubt:

No to the first part; yes to the second.

On the following Thursday, the 22nd of the same month and year, Our Most Holy Lord Pius XII, by divine Providence Pope, in the usual audience granted to His Excellency the Assessor of the Holy Office, heard and approved the resolution of their Eminences, confirmed it and ordered its publication.

Given at Rome from the Palace of the Holy Office, 28 Dec., 1949.

Peter Vigorita, Notary of the S.S.C.H.O.

*

*

*

*

Sacred Congregation of Rites.

Communication

In the desolation of destruction and ruin spread by the recent war, not even sacred edifices were spared. Many were totally ruined, many more damaged; and in the damage not only works of priceless art but musical organs also were in no small number destroyed or rendered useless.

It is superfluous to observe that in the sacred liturgy the organ occupies an important place. Even if it be only a small organ, the cost of building it is very considerable. Consequently, in recent times, Companies that manufacture musical instruments have invented electrophonic organs. These, indeed, are entirely inferior to wind organs, but are very convenient to make and to use.

In view of these facts, the Sacred Congregation of Rites, while confirming its absolute preference for the older pipe organ, as being more adapted to liturgical needs, nevertheless does not prohibit the use of electrophonic organs. Hence this Sacred Council, though acknowledging that the electric organ, in order to be a fitting substitute for the pipe organ, needs to be perfected and very much improved—the Companies should see to this—leaves it, however, to the judgment of Bishops and other Ordinaries, with the advice of their Diocesan Committees of Sacred Music, to allow the use of the electro-

phonic organs in particular cases, when it is not easy to obtain a pipe organ. Let such extra changes be made as the Diocesan Committees shall suggest.

Given at Rome, the 13th day of July, 1949.

+ C. Card. MICARA, Bp. of Velletri, *Prefect*.

+ A. Carinci, Abp. of Selencia, *Secretary*.

*

*

*

*

Introduction of the cause of Bishop Verjus.

It is of special interest to the whole of Australasia to know that on the eleventh of March, 1949, the Holy Father signed the Commission of the Introduction of the cause of the Servant of God, Henry Baptist Stanislaus Verjus, titular Bishop of Limyra and Coadjutor of the Vicar Apostolic of New Guinea, of the Congregation of Missionaries of the Sacred Heart of Jesus (MSC).

*

*

*

*

Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities.

Letter

to their Lordships the local Ordinaries.

Rome, 15 August, 1949.

My Lord,

No one is unaware how much the Holy See has always favoured Sacred Music as a means of promoting the worship of God. Many documents might be cited in proof of this special solicitude. It will be sufficient, however, to refer to those noteworthy regulations given by Pope Pius XI of happy memory. They are embodied in the Apostolic Constitution *Divini cultus sanctitatem*, published on the 20th of December, 1928; they are wise regulations and are still in force.

On its part, this Sacred Congregation has not been slack in its efforts to secure a thorough theoretic and practical training in Sacred Music for those young men who enter the way of the priesthood. Most Seminaries have responded to the solicitude of the Holy See, and have done much that is praiseworthy toward imbuing candidates for the sanctuary with musical knowledge and skill. There are, however, some Seminaries in which the desired results have not been at all obtained. The causes are more than one, but the chief cause of this failure was that teachers were not available who were sufficiently trained and equal to their tasks. This shortcoming is all the more clearly in evidence to-day because of the wide diffusion of liturgical and musical studies, either among those engaged in Catholic Action, or

amongst the ordinary faithful. The Holy Year is likely to show up still more any such deficiency.

Therefore, in order to give new and stronger impulse to a more intensive training of Seminary students in the theory and practice of Sacred Music according to the didactic and disciplinary principles laid down by the Holy See, we have decided to prescribe the following statutes:

I. Sacred Music is numbered among the necessary subjects of study and, therefore, it is absolutely required that it be taught to all aspirants to the sanctuary from the first year of humanity to the end of the theological course.

II. The yearly programmes of Sacred Music are to be drawn up by the Masters and approved by the Ordinary.

III. The number of hours assigned to Sacred Music each week shall be as laid down in the Apostolic Constitution *Divini cultus sanctitatem* (nn. 1-2). The hours of lectures are to be inserted in the general order of studies.

During the autumn holidays longer time shall be given to practical exercises for each individual, for groups or for the whole body of students. For students in philosophy and theology study weeks shall be arranged, to discuss more thoroughly the chief questions of Sacred Music.

IV. As for other subjects of study, so also students are obliged to undergo examinations in Sacred Music.

V. Each Seminary must have a competent Master of Sacred Music, who in all respects shall belong to the College of Professors..

In regard to Masters, we remind their Excellencies, the local Ordinaries, that it was the express desire of Pius XI of happy memory that young priests, chosen on account of their musical talent, should be sent from every part of the world to the Roman Pontifical Institute of Sacred Music. Men manifestly endowed with a true liturgical spirit, gifted with special musical ability, and sufficiently prepared, will be fully fitted by this higher course to exercise both in their Diocese and especially in their Seminary an abundant liturgico-musical apostolate.

VI. What is ordered above shall come into force at the beginning of the next scholastic year.

It will, therefore, be your duty, my Lord, to employ all care in seeing that the above statutes are accurately carried out. We are sure

that Sacred Music is a most useful means, now as in the past, of bringing back the Christian people to Christ our Lord. Indeed, the faithful people attracted by the sweetness and suavity of sacred harmony will more willingly fill the house of God. They will come when they know it to be a house resounding "with hymns and spiritual canticles". Consequently they will approach the mysteries of the Lord with more desire, and draw more abundantly therefrom the waters of life.

With every best wish in the Lord I reverently sign myself,

Your Lordship's devoted servant in Christ Jesus,

J. Card. PIZZARDO, *Prefect.*

H. Cecchetti, Under-secretary.

W. LEONARD.

Saint Thomas's World

Summary: Very different from our own was St. Thomas's view of the physical world. Some appreciation of it helps considerably towards a better understanding of his writings. Statements which astonish us now were part of the philosophy which he drew from Aristotle.

In contrast with the earthly elements and their natural rectilinear movements, were the heavenly bodies, whose circular movements were thought to demonstrate their essential superiority. St. Thomas maintained that heavenly bodies ruled all sublunary ones, for various *a priori* reasons.

Description of the structure of the universe, according to the most approved views: concentric spheres conveying the luminaries revolved round the earth, one for each of the "planets" and one for all the fixed stars. The *primum mobile* received its motion from God and transmitted this to the rest of the spheres, but to explain the divergent movements of the "planets" Aristotle postulated "intelligences," which St. Thomas interpreted as angels.

This meant that all corporal activity in the heavens and on earth was controlled by angels. "Spontaneous generation" thus became intelligible. The bearing of the heavens on all generation, on the possibility of horoscopes, on good fortune, and on some kinds of demoniacal vexation. The "evil age" and witchcraft incidentally explained.

Copernicus and Galileo were responsible for the eventual extinction of mediaeval physics and of a world-view that had advantages as well as limitations.

While allowing that human authority provided only the weakest of arguments, St. Thomas willingly accepted an authority as peerless in profane science, and this was Aristotle. The Stagirite was for him simply "the Philosopher", as he was for Dante "the master of the wise".

Every student knows that one of the saint's greatest achievements was to purify the teaching of the pagan genius who dominated human knowledge for a thousand years and to press it into the service of the Christian faith. Inter alia, he accepted Aristotle's views on nature, including the subjects of astronomy, physics, chemistry, zoology, botany, etc., all of which were covered by the general name of "physics". Minor contributions to St. Thomas's extraordinary fund of knowledge were made by other scientists, especially Ptolemy, the astronomer-geographer, while the unknown writer who passed for Dionysius the Areopagite impressed on him deeply the conviction that hierarchy, or descending gradations, ran through all creation.

No one is entitled to disparage the ancient and mediaeval physics simply because much of it was reversed after the invention of instruments of accurate observation. The heliocentric theory was really very old, but since it could not be proved and appeared to contradict the evidence of the senses it was rejected not only by Aristotle but also by the greater astronomer, Hipparchus, and by Ptolemy. When Coper-

nicus revived it, he was denounced by people who were no friends of St. Thomas, including Luther and Melancthon, while Francis Bacon ridiculed the Polish canon as "a man who thinks nothing of introducing fiction of any kind into nature, provided his calculations turn out well".

With all due respect to the Schoolmen, one may regret that they were so ready to find *a priori* reasons by their remarkable intellectual ingenuity, in support of the accepted theories in the physical sciences. They took the "scientists" too seriously, and therein lies a lesson. Even though we recognize this now and make all allowances, the devoted reader of St. Thomas receives a jolt when he first meets passages like the following: "Just as physicians can judge the quality of the intellect from the bodily constitution, so the astrologer can do likewise from the movements of the heavens as from the remote cause of a particular disposition" (*Contra Gentiles*, 3, 84). Or this: "Mirrors, if new and clear, contact a kind of blemish from the look of a *mulier menstruata*, as Aristotle says" (*Summa Theologiae*, I, 117, 3 ad 2).

The fact is that St. Thomas's world was in many respects very different from our own. Some attention to this fact helps us to appreciate better the great *Summae* in which his view of nature is always supposed and frequently manifested. We thus become better acquainted, moreover, with the mediaeval mind in general.

Separating the chaff of outmoded physics does not mean ignoring the abundant wheat of the Thomist harvest. St. Thomas himself would have been the first to make the winnowing. There remains the *philosophia perennis* whose value time cannot alter and which criticism only serves to appraise more highly. To use a popular expression that is really good English, St. Thomas can take it.

The very old query, What is matter made of?, which has led modern physicists so far without their reaching any finality, was answered by the Angelic Doctor, following Aristotle, with the doctrine of the four elements. The simplest forms to which terrestrial bodies could be reduced were earth, air, fire and water. Excepting the heavens, all matter consisted of one or more of these supposedly unanalysable substances. Each of the elements had its proper "place", or home, and that was where it naturally came to rest. Earth found its place in the lowermost position, on earth, always tending towards its like; water, immediately above earth; air, above water; and highest of all was the natural place of fire. That was the simplest reason why fire and air went *up* and earth and water went *down*, "up" and "down" being regarded as absolute.

The fact that a piece of earth, when thrown in the air, returned to the ground was Aristotle's proof that there could be no other earth in the universe, since all earth tended towards the centre of our earth, and the fact that it came down in a straight line showed that our globe was not rotating, as some philosophers had thought (*De Coelo*, 2).

Special significance was seen in the path followed by the elements in their "natural" movements—up and down—which, apart from constraint, was always a straight line. Now, rectilinear movement was clearly imperfect, because its velocity changed as it progressed, and then it ceased (indeed, infinite progress in a straight line was considered impossible); but circular movement was perfect, for it was constant, it had no terminus, and it was capable of being eternal. There was something in the universe to which circular movement was natural, and that was the heavenly body. This observation was of the greatest importance, for it showed the essential superiority of celestial over terrestrial substance. It showed in particular that celestial substance was not made of any of the four elements—for then it would move in straight lines—but of an entirely different stuff, a "fifth body", or quintessence. "*Non enim coelum est ex elementis compositum nec naturae elementaris: quod ejus motus ostendit a motibus omnium elementorum diversus*" (C.G. 3, 43).

Being material, however, the celestial substance was composed of prime matter and substantial form, but the union of these principles was more perfect than any on earth. Whereas all sublunary substances were changeable simply because the potentialities of the prime matter were not exhausted by the form, the heavenly bodies were unchangeable in their *esse* because "the form possesses the entire potency of the matter" and consequently "the matter is no longer in potency to another form" (C.G. 3, 20). Free from contrariety, those wonderful bodies were "neither light nor heavy, neither hot nor cold" (C.G. 3, 82). Imperishable and impervious to evil, they stood in a degree of perfection between the angelic natures and the earthly. (C.G. 3, 20).

Seeing that heavenly bodies were perfect, what could be more fitting than that they should control the earthly, the imperfect? That celestial bodies controlled the terrestrial, was argued in a chapter of the *Contra Gentiles* (3, 82) that is a fair specimen of an *a priori* approach to answering a question of fact. The arguments advanced are seven. (1) From analogy between material and spiritual substances; for amongst the angels the higher ranks govern the lower "so that the

orderly arrangement of divine providence might descend in due proportions to the lower; therefore *pari ratione* the lower bodies are governed by the higher." (2) The more elevated the "place" of anything is, the more "formal" is that thing (an Aristotelian assumption); but the heavenly bodies are higher than all others, hence more "formal" and hence more active, and therefore they act upon the lower, which accordingly are controlled by them. (3) Because they attain their natural perfection without contrariety, as their movements show, their power has a more universal scope than that of earthly substances, and hence they move and govern these. (4) Their imperishability makes them resemble the angels more than other bodies do and, furthermore, they are nearer to them; and as angels govern all corporeal things so the celestial bodies govern the lower. (5) They approach immobility, insofar as they have only one motion, the local, and immobility is a prerogative of a source of motion. (6) The first in any class is the cause of what follows in that class, and amongst all motion the movement of the heavens (which is solely local) is first: because only local motion can be perpetual; because local motion underlies all other motions, both alterative and augmentative; and because local motion alone involves no intrinsic change. (7) What is motionless in respect of a particular kind of motion, is the cause of that kind of motion: hence something that is itself unalterable must be the cause of alteration; but the heavenly bodies are themselves unalterable, as may be seen from their unchanging condition. "Therefore the heavenly body is the cause of all alteration in things that alter (namely, all earthly things). But alteration is the starting-point of all motions in earthly things, since alteration gives rise to change of size and to the production of new forms, and what thus produces is the mover *per se* in the (natural) local movements of what is heavy and light. *Sic ergo patet quod corpora inferiora per superiora reguntur*". In fine, the heavenly movements are the primary motions and the remote causes of all natural processes and earthly changes. Elsewhere St. Thomas made it clear that only two classes of effects were excepted from the causality of the heavenly action, namely, those that occur *per accidens* ("as when a fall of stone starts an earthquake or when a man digging a grave finds a treasure") and acts of free will (S.T. II-II, 95, 5).

The heavenly movements and influences were connected with an interesting view of the structure of the world as a whole. The universe was spherical, with the earth, also round, at its centre (S.T. I, 68, 4 ad

1; I-II, 64, 2 ad 2).¹ Around the earth revolved the heavenly bodies, not moving in a void but set in a series of concentric, rotating spheres, or "heavens". Their arrangement might be compared with the layers in an onion, or with spherical shells one outside another. They worked like wheels within wheels. Their substance was the "fifth body" and was solid, but being transparent ("diaphanous") it was penetrated by the light of the luminaries in more distant spheres (S.T. I, 70, 1 ad 3), and so, on looking to the heavens we saw the luminaries but not their spheres. Christ's glorified body passed through the solid substance of the heavens only by divine power, just as it passed through the walls of the Cenacle (S.T. III, 67, 4).

The minimum number to which the spheres could be reduced was eight: one for each of the seven wandering stars and one for all the fixed stars. The so-called wandering stars, or "planets", in order of their assumed proximity to the earth, were the moon, Mercury, Venus, the sun, Mars, Jupiter and Saturn. Each of these was borne by its particular sphere. Beyond that was the sphere in which were fixed the countless luminous bodies whose relative positions never seemed to change and which appeared to move across the sky together. This sphere, the eight from us, was regarded by Aristotle as the *primum mobile*, or "first moved", but later astronomers added another sphere, commonly called the "crystalline", as the first of the moved heavens, and with this estimate St. Thomas agreed. "*Unde necesse est quod supra sphaeram stellarum fixarum sit alia circumdans totum, quae revolvit totum coelum motu diurno; et hoc est primum mobile, quod movetur a primo motore secundum Aristotelem*" (In Metaph., XII, 9).²

¹Aristotle had inferred the sphericity of the earth from the curve of the earth's shadow as seen in eclipses. He also made this wise reflection, from which Christopher Columbus is said to have taken a hint: "One should not be too sure of the incredibility of the view of those who conceive that there is continuity between the parts about the Pillars of Hercules and the parts about India and that in this way the ocean is one" (*De Coelo*, 2).

²Aristotle had thought it necessary to posit no fewer than fifty-five spheres in order to explain certain movements which later astronomers accounted for with theories of eccentrics and epicycles, thus keeping the number required by natural philosophy down to eight. Some Christian writers postulated a special physical heaven, above all the others, as the abode of the blessed, and this was called *coelum empyreum*, or fiery heaven, a name denoting its splendour and not the terrestrial element, fire, as St. Thomas pointed out. This was the glorious heaven of light that Dante described as the greatest manifestation of "*la gloria di Colui che tutto muove*" (Paradiso 1). Another celestial region sometimes considered necessary because Genesis had spoke of "waters above the firmament" was an aqueous heaven, which, since it could not have been composed of the element, water, St. Thomas was content to interpret as the crystalline sphere, totally tran-

The movement of the *primum mobile*, the initial movement in the mechanism of the universe, must be due to the action of an incorporeal agent, himself unmoved, whom even Aristotle had recognized as God, the *Motor Immobilis*, the first cause of all activity in the world (C.G. I, 13; 1, 20). The movement God caused in the *primum mobile* was transmitted to the lower spheres, all making a single revolution in a day. Since in addition to their diurnal movement the sun and other "planets" had special periodic or seasonal movements, Aristotle postulated distinct motive agents for each of them, and these he called "intelligences". St. Thomas cleared up some of the obscurity attaching to the "intelligences" by identifying them with angels. Thus angels also moved the spheres.

The particular order of angels considered appropriate for the office was the Virtues. "Hence it seems that to this order belongs the movement of the heavenly bodies from which as from universal causes there follow particular effects in nature; and hence they are called "*Virtutes coelorum*" in Luke 21, 26" (C.G. 3, 80).

All corporeal things are governed by angels: "*omnia corporalia reguntur per angelos*" (S.T. I, 110, 1). This momentous assertion not only made the angels custodians of men, as Catholic doctrine requires, but it put them in control of the stars in their courses. Adding this to what has already been said about the effect of the stars upon nature, it followed that the angels held the key positions in the universe, and were principal causes of the processes of nature. "If separate substances move the heavenly bodies, as philosophers affirm,³ whatever is due to the movement of the heavenly bodies is attributed to those bodies as *instruments*, since they cause motion by being put in motion, and to the separate movers as *principal agents*. They act and move by means of their intellect. Therefore they cause whatever results from the movement of the heavenly bodies, as an artisan works through his tools: *sicut artifex operatur per sua instrumenta*" (C.G. 2, 99).

The union of the angels with the spheres they moved could not

sparent heaven which some astronomers placed between the fixed stars and the empyrean. (S.T. I, 68, 4). Alphonso the Wise thought that the crystalline heaven accounted for the apparent libration of the spheres called "trepidation". Accordingly we read in Milton's "Paradise Lost": "They pass the Planets seven, and pass the fixt. And that Crystalline Sphear whose balance weighs The trepidation talkt, and that first mov'd" (Bk. 3, 484).

³The clause "as philosophers affirm" may seem guarded, but it is clear from other places that St. Thomas accepted their affirmation. It was sound enough to provide him with an argument that angels must know "singulars", since they undoubtedly knew the particular orb they moved *per intellectum*. (S.T. I, 57, 3).

accurately be called "animation", for it was not substantial, like that of soul and body, but simply an exertion of angelic power. "A heaven is composed of mover and moved, not like form and matter, but *per contactum virtutis*" (S.T. I, 70, 3 ad 5). The angel did not move with the sphere, even *per accidens*, but applied its power in one quarter, namely, the eastern side of the heaven (S.T. I, 51, 3 ad 3).

Thus could be explained certain effects in nature exceeding the power of their proximate causes, for example, "spontaneous generation". St. Thomas did not, as is sometimes thought, regard the production of animal life in lifeless matter as an origin simply of the living from the non-living. The phenomenon was due to a heavenly body, the sun, and in particular to the living spirit which imparted to that body an instrumental power that it, in turn, exercised on the inanimate matter. "*Corpus coeleste, cum sit movens motum, habet rationem instrumenti quod agit in virtute principalis agentis. Et ideo ex virtute sui motoris, qui est substantia vivens, potest causare vitam*" (S.T. I, 70, 3 ad 3). This ingenious solution anticipated the modern biological principle, *omne vivum e vivo*, but not in the sense intended by biologists.

Whereas the lowly form of life produced in the manner just described were classed as imperfect, the perfect were those produced not only by the sun but by seed and the sun. "*Viventia perfecta non solum generantur virtute coelesti sed etiam ex semine: homo enim generat hominem et sol*" (C.G. 3, 104). "Man is begotten by man and the sun"—an arresting statement, which St. Thomas got from Aristotle. In the process of generation the formative power in the seed was acted on by three heats, the igneous, the celestial, and the animal (C.G. 2, 86). The intellectual power of the soul given to a body depended on the bodily disposition, and soft flesh was a sign of mental aptitude (S.T. I, 85, 7).

As to the determination of sex, St. Thomas agreed with "the Philosopher" in the astounding conclusion that "a female is a mischanced male—*femina est mas occasionatus*". "A woman is something deficient and mischanced, because the active power in the male seed tends to produce a perfect likeness, in the form of the male sex, and if a female is begotten this is due to a weakness in the active power, or to some indisposition of the material, or even to some transmutative influence from without, for example, the south winds, which are moist.—*puta a ventis australibus, qui sunt humidi*—as is said in Book IV of *De Generatione Animalium*". (S.T. I, 1 ad 1). No comment is necessary.

Most surprising of all, probably, is the extent to which heavenly bodies were thought to influence our lives. St. Thomas endorsed, as philosophically justifiable, Ptolemy's statement that Mercury confers a radical excellence of intelligence if at a person's birth that planet be "in one of the houses of Saturn and strong" (G.C. 3, 84). Furthermore, some men were born fortunate, others unfortunate, at least for particular pursuits. "For the impressions of the heavenly bodies cause natural bodily dispositions in us, and thus, because of the disposition left in our body by a heavenly body, a person is said not only to have good or ill fortune, but also to be well or ill born. . . . Hence there is nothing to prevent a man from receiving from the impression of a heavenly body some efficacy that another man has not, in doing certain things: for example, a physician in healing, a cultivator in planting, and a soldier in fighting" (C.G. 3, 92).

Celestial activity did not, as the Stoics thought, arrange all our acts and choices. But it had an indirect effect on our choices, by providing occasions for them. It even affected our passions, or emotions, by acting upon the bodily organs with which they were connected; "insofar as they (heavenly bodies) act on our bodies and the resulting change is followed by movements of the passions, just as choleric persons are prone to anger" (C.G. 3, 85). This made it possible to predict what the generality of men would do, since most men followed their natural impulses and only the wise were strong enough to resist them. That was why Ptolemy had said that astrologers' pronouncements should be in general terms: "*quia scilicet impressio stellarum in pluribus sortitur effectum. . . . non autem semper in hoc vel illo*" (C.G. 3, 85).

Human responsibility, however, always remained, for both reason and experience showed that our choice was free and in no wise caused by the stars. At most, they caused the suggestive circumstances in which our choice had to be made: they could not cause the motions of the will. Only God, who made the will and sustained it in being, could cause its motions. "*A solo igitur Deo potest motus voluntatis causari*" (C.G. 3, 88).

At certain phases of the moon, demons had a special opportunity to torment human beings because "the brain, the wettest of the body's parts, as Aristotle says, is most subject to the action of the moon, whose property it is to move fluid". But the brain was the centre of the animal powers, and thus, when the brain was disposed for the effects

they wanted, demons disturbed the human fancy in conjunction with the phases of the moon. (S.T. I, 115, 5).

The evil eye was accepted as a reality and explained as follows. The eyes could infect the air up to a certain distance, and that was why the look of a menstruous woman soiled mirrors, as Aristotle said. "In the same way, when the soul was greatly stirred towards evil, as happened, especially in old women, a person's look became poisonous and noxious, especially for children, their body being soft and impressionable" (S.T. I, 117, 3 ad 3). No one should take exception to St. Thomas's parting reminder that in the case of witches the possibility of a secret pact with devils had also to be reckoned with.

The natural philosophy of the middle ages was nothing if not comprehensive. It comprised all things in heaven and earth and confidently explained terrestrial things by referring them to their proximate and remote causes. Its chief weakness lay in its excessive reference to the heavens, almost a pardonable feature and certainly one that gave it grandeur. Substantially the same world-view was shared by St. Thomas, Dante, Shakespeare, and Milton, to whose genius its wide, cosmic sweep offered free play. When shall we see their like again?

The real cleavage between the mediaeval mentality and that of modern times was cut by Galileo's telescope. When the Copernican hypothesis was eventually demonstrated and at length accepted, the neat, compact, integral world which men believed they knew vanished, to give way to the more marvellous, yet unfathomable, elusive universe that nobody claims to know completely.

St. Thomas showed his greatness when he declared that the mediaeval physics, based on the movements of the heavens, might one day be superseded. Within a year or two of his holy death in 1274, he wrote these words in *De Coelo et Mundo*: "Although on such assumptions appearances are safeguarded, it cannot necessarily be said that the assumptions are true, because appearances concerning the stars may perhaps be safeguarded in some other way not yet grasped by men".

CORNELIUS ROBERTS.

Bishop Willson, III.

Summary: Bishop Willson prepares for his labours—Advice of Dr. Ullathorne—Seeks priests for Tasmania—Sir John Franklin on need of priests—Willson writes to Lord Stanley—Long correspondence on matter—Demand for five priests—Plan to take students to Tasmania—Visit to Rome—Audience with Gregory XVI—Visits asylums and prisons in France—Renewed correspondence with Lord Stanley—Government agrees to send two priests and two students with Dr. Willson—Nottingham farewells Dr. Willson—Bishop Willson and party sail for Hobart (January, 1844)—Bishop Willson lands at Hobart (11 May, 1844)—Goes to St. Joseph's Church and meets Fr. Therry—Takes possession of See of Hobart.

PREPARATION FOR VOYAGE.

One very real advantage the newly-appointed Bishop of Hobart enjoyed. Having given long hours to the study of documents, papers, and reports sent to London by overseas officials, he was well informed as to the needs of his diocese. He had at hand, too, a personal friend and a prudent adviser in Dr. Ullathorne, a man thoroughly acquainted with the history, the struggles, and the spiritual desolations of the Catholics transported to Van Diemen's Land. The arena of his future labours, hardships, and conquests stood out in clear light before Dr. Willson's vision: he could speak and write as though he had already been to the battlefield.

First and foremost priests had to be selected to bring the Gospel message to men in actual bondage and to those on probation, still subject to Government supervision and control. Two questions called for consideration: How many missionaries would be required? How many could Government be persuaded to support? Dr. Polding had omitted to discuss this subject in reference to Van Diemen's Land, thinking it better to let the new Bishop state his own case and devise his own plans. Certain it was that there were hundreds—even thousands—of unhappy men totally deprived of the rites and consolations of religion; while there were numerous free settlers inadequately served by three priests now recognised by the terms of the Colonial Church Act.

Sir John Franklin, whose term of office as Lieutenant-Governor had expired in 1843, had represented to the Imperial Government the urgency of the need for spiritual aid for Catholics condemned to penal servitude in his territory. Men were now being sent direct from Ireland, the Catholics amongst them being naturally numerous:

"The Influx of prisoners from Ireland and the consequent large increase in the Roman Catholic population in Tasman's Peninsula under the regulations adopted for carrying out the Probation System render

it imperative upon me to represent to Your Lordship the spiritual wants of that portion of the convict population. A Roman Catholic clergyman of decided piety, of sound discretion, and Christian moderation would have it in his power to exercise a powerful influence in the moral improvement of this class of offenders, and might contribute largely to the satisfactory carrying out of the system which we are anxiously labouring to establish on the surest and most efficient footing.

"The probationary Agricultural Farm established in Tasman's Peninsula . . . is cultivated entirely by Irish Roman Catholic convicts. It is for this Station that I am particularly anxious to secure the services of such a minister as Your Lordship may consider adapted to the task, but who might at the same time afford occasional instruction to the other Roman Catholics on Tasman's Peninsula".¹

Up to the date of Bishop Willson's appointment nothing had been done in response to Franklin's suggestion, neglect to take action being in some measure due to the absence of any recognised ecclesiastical authority personally interested in pressing Catholic claims. Now at length the scene was changing. There was a Bishop able to speak as one having power, prepared to do things instead of recommending that they should be done, accepted by the Imperial Government as Head of the Catholic Church in Van Diemen's Land. He opened his campaign by addressing the Secretary of State, Lord Stanley:²

"George Street, Nottingham,

"6 November, 1842.

"My Lord,—The Most Reverend Dr. Polding, Catholic Archbishop, Sydney, having consigned the spiritual superintendence of the Catholic population of Van Diemen's Land to my care, I feel it incumbent on me most respectfully to address Your Lordship on the subject of a letter placed in my hands, together with other papers referring to that Colony.

"As no Catholic clergyman has been out in virtue of that grant, and as the spiritual wants of the Catholic population must be very great at this time, I most respectfully beg leave to ask, if I shall be warranted in selecting five clergymen whose names I should have the honour to submit to Your Lordship in order to comply with the wish there expressed by the Government?

"I also find from a letter dated, Downing Street, 20th April, 1842, Your Lordship was pleased to request that the name of a Catholic clergy-

¹*Tas. State Records.*

²*Colonial Correspondence.*

man should be submitted who should attend to the spiritual wants of the Roman Catholic population of Tasman's Peninsula.

"I beg leave to state, that in selecting the Catholic clergymen for the arduous and highly responsible duties of attending the convict population, etc., it will be my earnest endeavour to choose men of known probity and sound discretion, in order that they may render all the service in their power to the Government in carrying out a system that may tend to ameliorate the condition of the Convict, and render physical coercion as little necessary as possible.

"Before leaving England I feel deeply interested in selecting these clergymen who are to go to that distant country, myself, for reasons which will at once be obvious to Your Lordship; and I therefore most humbly beg that Your Lordship will be pleased to confirm the grants I have referred to, in order to warrant me in making that necessary arrangement.

"Permit me, my Lord, further to add that I have for several years paid much attention to the treatment of the insane, and did it not savour of vanity, I might venture to refer Your Lordship to the Magistrates, etc., who have the charge of the Nottingham Lunatic Asylum as to their opinion of my humble endeavours to assist the insane; and I mention this subject, as I believe there is no organised Lunatic Asylum in Van Diemen's Land.

"Should it be the wish of the Government at any time to form such an establishment there, I beg leave to say that, if permitted, I shall be too happy in affording all the assistance I can, by giving information respecting the treatment of patients in the principal Asylums of England, France, and Belgium.

"I have the honour, etc.,

WILLIAM WILLSON,

Catholic Bishop".

Finding that correspondence was not producing the desired results, but merely a stereotyped assurance that the subject-matter of his letters was 'under Lord Stanley's consideration', the Bishop made up his mind to seek a personal interview:

"George Street, Nottingham,

"16th January, 1843.

"My Lord,—Feeling desirous to enter as soon as possible upon the fresh field of labour assigned to me with the convicts of Van Diemen's Land whose spiritual wants, I am given to understand, are of a very

deplorable nature, perhaps Your Lordship would allow me the honour of having an interview with you. Upon a short notice I should have great pleasure in going to London at any time Your Lordship should appoint—I have the honour, etc.,

WILLIAM WILLSON, D.D.”³

What took place at the interview with Lord Stanley may be gathered from a communication received by the Bishop:

“Downing Street, 31 Jan., 1843.

“Sir,—Referring to your interview with Lord Stanley I am directed to acquaint you that in a Despatch dated the 10th July, 1841, Sir John Franklin requested that a Roman Catholic clergyman should be sent out to Van Diemen’s Land for the service of the Convict Establishment at Tasman’s Peninsula.

“On the 20th April, 1842, an extract of that Despatch was communicated to the Rev. Dr. Heptonstall, who was, at the time, informed that Lord Stanley was prepared to sanction the appointment of any clergyman whom he might be able to recommend as qualified for that service.

“If no step has yet been taken upon that letter it is owing entirely to the fact that Dr. Heptonstall has not sent in any recommendation as suggested.

“With regard to the intention which you represented to have been expressed in my letter to the Rev. Dr. Polding, of the 11th of November, 1841 (an increase of four ministers), I am directed by Lord Stanley to observe to you that, as you will perceive on reperusing it, that letter contains no announcement of such an intention; and Lord Stanley directs me to add that it is not usual to sanction the appointment of clergyman to the Ecclesiastical Establishments in the Australian Colonies without the express recommendation of the Governor of the Colony.

“It will, however, in all probability, be necessary before long to appoint some additional Roman Catholic clergyman for the Convict Establishments in Van Diemen’s Land, with moderate salaries; and Lord Stanley directs me to state that he will be happy to receive, prospectively, your recommendation of any clergyman whom you may consider qualified for that service.

“I have the honour, etc., G. W. HOPE”.

In a letter dated Nottingham, 10th February, 1843, Dr. Willson

³Dr. Willson used the name *William* up to this time in several letters.

enquired: "What number of Catholic clergymen Your Lordship would wish me to recommend *at present*, and what remuneration the Government proposes making them". He added:

"Being anxious to procure the services of prudent, pious and sensible men for this important task, I should be grateful to know as soon as Your Lordship would be pleased to inform me.

"With respect to the amount of salaries, I beg leave to observe that I am only desirous for my clergy to have a decent maintenance, as I hope the motive that will alone induce them to leave their native land to labour with the unfortunate convicts, will be the salvation of souls".

The official decision was that for the present the selection of Catholic clergymen would be limited to two: that it, to one "in addition to the one whom Dr. Heptonstall was invited to select. It is still proposed to grant the same rate of remuneration stated—viz., £200 salary, with lodging and rations".

To secure for himself and for his flock the blessing of Pope Gregory XVI, the Bishop paid a visit to Rome. The Pope received him with great kindness, speaking for a long time on the state of religion in the distant diocese. Travelling through France and Belgium, Dr. Willson inspected many institutes devoted to the welfare of the victims of mental diseases, as well as prisons and reformatories. He held conferences with eminent specialists, obtained reports, and studied every feature of medical and penal practice and discipline. Knowledge thus acquired was to prove of inestimable value in Van Diemen's Land, at the time so liberally endowed with hospitals, prisons, and other public institutions.

In reply to another letter pointing out how the Catholics had increased in numbers since aid had been recommended; and how they must have suffered spiritually because recommendations had not been carried into effect. Dr. Willson was informed:

"In the present uncertainty as to the arrangements which may have been made in Van Diemen's Land in regard to the establishment of Roman Catholic clergy His Lordship cannot sanction any increase in their number without the previous recommendation of the Local Authorities. Lord Stanley will, however, instruct the newly appointed Governor, Sir E. Eardley Wilmot,⁴ to direct his attention to the subject, and to make an early Report which may enable Her Majesty's

⁴Lt.-Governor, Aug., 1843, to Oct., 1846.

Government to decide how far it may be proper or necessary to sanction any increase to the present number of Roman Catholic clergymen”.

In support of his claim the Bishop wrote on August 7, 1843:—

“I believe I am justified in taking it for granted that in looking for a Report which would enable the Government to decide about any increase in the existing number of Catholic clergy, Your Lordship refers to the number of Catholic clergymen whose ministry may be required for the *free population, but not for the convicts*. Your Lordship will pardon me, I trust, in repeating the fact that there are at present *only three* Catholic clergymen in the whole Colony;⁵ that as a necessary consequence, the moral condition of the Catholic population, both free and convict, is most deplorable, and which is made clearly manifest to me from private sources: and further, that Lord John Russell was prepared, full three years since,—in 1840—to receive the recommendations of as many Catholic Clergymen for New South Wales and Van Diemen’s Land as provision had been made for in the Colonial Estimates”.

“I have ventured to say that in consequence of the paucity, or rather almost total want of religion instruction, the moral condition of those so neglected is truly deplorable; and I have no doubt that Your Lordship will not be disposed to question that conclusion. It is impossible to read, as I have done, with a view of making myself acquainted with the history of our Penal Settlement, the Government documents relating to Transportation, or the printed statistical tables of those Colonies; or, indeed, any of the works written on the subject by Judge Burton, the Rev. Dr. Lang, the Rev. Dr. Ullathorne, and others—men of various parties and creeds who have had much experience on this momentous subject—without at once admitting the connexion as cause and effect between religious destitution and a low state of moral feeling and conduct.

“Your Lordship’s despatch to Sir John Franklin, dated Nov. 25th, 1842, . . . is decisive evidence of your solicitude on this head, and of an earnest desire that in the future treatment of the convicts in Van Diemen’s Land and Norfolk Island, that unfortunate class of our fellow beings should have every aid which a sound and judicious moral training can bestow.

“It is therefore in their behalf especially that I deem it a sacred

⁵Fathers Cotham (1835); Therry (1838); Butler (1839).

and important duty to address Your Lordship with a view that intentions, so well conceived and ably developed, may be effectually carried out, and this by obtaining Your Lordship's sanction that Catholic clergymen may be *at once* sent out on this errand of mercy, and that they may be in number sufficient to meet the wants of the destitute and abandoned class for which their sacred duties are required.

"In order to enable Your Lordship to form a judgment both as to the number that may be required and the propriety, not to say the necessity, of authority being given me to make the selection without delay, I will take the liberty of placing before Your Lordship a few of the data and reasons which have influenced and guided me in forming my own opinion.

"As to the probable number of Catholic convicts—there does not seem to be any great difficulty in making a calculation on this head sufficiently near the truth for all available purposes.

"I have been informed that, with the exception of the convicts now on Tasman's Peninsula, few, or none have been sent from Ireland for several years to Van Diemen's Land. But this fact does not prove the absence of Catholic convicts there"

The Bishop, having given facts and figures compiled carefully from the best authorities, continues:—

"Thus it would appear that by the end of the current year more than *five thousand convicts* will demand our spiritual aid, and I now look to Your Lordship with all earnestness and confidence to award the same amount of religious assistance to the unhappy members of my future flock, that is awarded to other Christian communities in that Colony".

The Bishop then proceeds to point out some of the reasons which were impelling him to seek aid:

"1st. As there are at present only three Catholic clergymen in the Colony, it is utterly impossible for them to render anything like adequate assistance to the Catholic population, to render, *even to the sick and dying*, dispersed as they are over the whole island, to say nothing of other important duties, such as giving moral instruction to the adults and younger members of their scattered flocks—and especially those exhortations which are so peculiarly needful for the convict class.

"2nd. It is a well-known and established and acknowledged fact that however depraved the moral character of the Catholic may be, he will not accept the assistance of any other minister of religion but his

own, however great may be the moral worth of the individual of another creed, proffering his services.

"3rd. Were Your Lordship to wait until information from the newly appointed Governor can be obtained little less, if any less, than eighteen months or two years, must pass over, before spiritual assistance can be made available!

"4th. I would respectfully beg Your Lordship's especial attention to this consideration, that as I have not a college expressly for the education of clergymen for this mission of charity, it is difficult beyond expression to obtain persons possessing the will and at the same time *the fitting qualifications* for a duty so onerous and so important. Men whom the Catholic Bishops would gladly spare would not suit; and such men as from their unaffected piety, zeal, sound sense and discretion, would be most valuable, those prelates are naturally unwilling to spare. With this perplexing obstacle to contend with I am most anxious to be permitted to make the selection myself before I leave the country; for it would be cruel towards those who are suffering for their offences in banishment, useless to the Government, and most humiliating and discouraging to myself were restless, worldly-minded, discontented, or indiscreet men, to enter upon so sacred an employment.

"5th. As a system is about to be adopted, calculated in my humble judgment, with a few alterations, and if well carried out, to be of incalculable benefit to the unfortunate convicts and to the Colony at large, it appears to me that the clergy should be as soon as possible in the field, and endeavour by all means in their power *at the commencement of this proposed system* to encourage the convict to patience and humble submission; and to teach him to look forward with *lively hope* (the very principle of the proposed system if I understand it rightly) to the day of liberation, which, however distant, may bring with it comparative comfort, and perhaps even domestic happiness to him. For if ever counsel, sound advice, and kind encouragement were needful to any class of our fellow-beings, they must most assuredly be so at the beginning of such a mighty system as that which Your Lordship so humanely contemplates.

"The only question then, as I humbly conceive, is whether I shall at once be permitted to endeavour to procure such a body of men as may, by the Almighty's divine assistance, have the needful qualifications for the fulfillment of, perhaps, the most sacred and important office that one class of men can perform for another—or for many,

many months to pass over, and this critical task of selection be consigned to another (could I meet with one who would burden himself with the responsibility) and who cannot be supposed to feel so intensely as I do myself on the subject. I shall therefore most anxiously wait for Your Lordship's answer to my simple and unadorned statement, resting my hopes on the justice and humanity of the case, and not on very laboured efforts of my own, trusting that He that deigned to look with mercy on the malefactor when dying on the cross, and whose 'image and likeness' the unhappy convict still bears—although, perhaps, disfigured with much crime—that He who has promised even the reward of eternal life to those who minister to the imprisoned, in these words: '*Come ye blessed of my Father . . . for I was in prison, and you came to me*', will inspire Your Lordship to show mercy and to '*do justice* to those who, in the language of Holy Writ are literally *sitting in darkness and in the shadow of death*.

"I trust I may be allowed to add before concluding, that we may hope that the page that will henceforward record the history of our penal settlement will present a fairer aspect than the past—for, I apprehend, no British subject could peruse the Parliamentary documents and other papers referring to the history of Transportation, up to a certain period, without blushing and shuddering at the facts therein disclosed, and fearful amount of human blood that has been spilled whilst he finds on the other hand a corresponding want of moral means, as if men in their banishment had been considered mere irrational beings, and the truth of Our Blessed Lord, recorded in the Gospel either doubted of, or disbelieved altogether".

The Bishop looked forward with confidence "to the continuance of the present more rational state of things, and to the regeneration of many who have fallen, and also the peace and prosperity of the Colony".

Dr. Willson was referred to Lord Stanley's letters of an earlier date by which the Bishop was invited to send in the names of such priests as he deemed qualified for duty in the penal settlements. Of these Lord Stanley "was prepared to sanction the immediate appointment of two to embark by an early opportunity".

The attempt to find volunteer missionaries was not proving very successful. Some of those who offered did not appear to possess the required qualifications for the special work to be done; some possessing the gifts that marked them out, were slow to respond to the invita-

tion to go abroad. One year had elapsed since his consecration, when Dr. Willson was at length able to write:—

“George Street, Nottingham,

“16th October, 1843.

“My Lord—Before my departure for Van Diemen’s Land, I beg to inform Your Lordship that I have been so fortunate as to meet with three young men of high character and ability who would accompany me thither and devote a good portion of their time as Catechists and also prepare themselves for the priesthood.

“As some of the most respectable and hardworking men now in New South Wales were young, such as those who now offer themselves to me; and as the difficulty is so truly perplexing in procuring proper persons for this work of charity I fervently hope Your Lordship will consent for me to take them. I only ask for the cost of their passage out, and will strive myself to maintain them, until they receive Holy Orders. The three young men are all in England, and two of them are far advanced in their studies.

“I beg leave also to add that I have met with a most respectable person willing to go out with me as priest, in every way fitted for that sacred duty; and, as I have explained the deplorable state of the Catholics in Van Diemen’s Land this seems to be the most advantageous offer to me. I beg that Your Lordship will allow me to send this gentleman’s name to the Colonial Office in addition to the two who are to accompany me....

“I have the honour, etc., R. W. WILLSON”.

A few days later some progress was announced:

“Nottingham, 20th Oct., 1843.

“My Lord—From the difficulty of obtaining the services of such gentlemen as I could wish to take to Van Diemen’s Land, I have not been able until this day to send names to Your Lordship.

“Permit me now most respectfully to recommend that the Rev. William Hall and the Rev. Norbert Woolfrey may have their names placed with my own.

“Allow me also, my Lord, to submit further that the Rev. William Bond, a clergyman possessing qualifications which would fit him admirably for the important duty in Van Diemen’s Land, may be permitted to join me. I think I should be able to obtain his services.

“I have lately met with three young men who are willing to accompany me as Catechists. Two are excellent scholars and both about 22

years of age: the third is not so far advanced; but he is only 18 years old and I cannot speak too highly of him. They would assist in instructing in the prisons and elsewhere, and also devote as much time as was convenient in preparing themselves for Holy Orders.

"I only ask for the cost of their outfit and passage. I would strive to maintain them in my own house as I believe it would be the means of procuring some prudent and zealous men to labour with the convicts, etc. The immense difficulty I have had in procuring the names of those I now respectfully offer to Your Lordship makes me doubly urgent in pressing my request that I may be permitted *to take those I recommend with me.*

"Begging for an answer at Your Lordship's earliest convenience in order that I may leave England as soon as possible.

"I have the honour, etc.,

"R. W. WILLSON".

The Bishop was informed that Lord Stanley had 'sanctioned the appointment of the Rev. W. Hall and the Rev. Norbert Woolfrey, as Roman Catholic clergymen whose services will be required for the convicts of the Roman Catholic communion in Van Diemen's Land'; the name of the Rev. W. Bond would be borne in mind should occasion arise for an increase of Catholic clergymen in that Colony; and that there was no knowledge of any fund for defraying expenses and outfit of Catechists.

On receipt of this communication the Bishop made the following observations:—

"1. I have explained the extreme difficulty I found in providing such clergymen as I could wish to take out. Last Summer the Reverend William Bond, who belonged to Bishop Baines, of Prior Park, expressed a very strong desire to go with me, and from my knowledge of that gentleman I was equally anxious to take him; but his Bishop positively refused. Since that time Bishop Baines died, and the gentleman who now as Vicar-General directs the district formerly belonging to Dr. Baines until a Bishop is appointed in it (which is expected every day), consents for Mr. Bond to join me. Should I not be able to obtain Mr. Bond now I am morally certain that I should not when the new Bishop is appointed.

"2. Again: I am sure when Your Lordship hears a correct account of the spiritual necessities of the Catholic population in Van Diemen's Land, both convict and free, that you will deem it necessary

that some proper men should proceed thither to fulfil a sacred trust—prudence therefore compels me now most respectfully and most earnestly to beg of Your Lordship to allow me to take this respectable person with me.

“3. When Your Lordship reflects that one of the two who are to join me has been asked for by the Government as far back as 1841,—and that the Colonial Government had made provision for three others, I trust you will not deem me unreasonable in pressing this point at this time.

“With regard to the three young men who are willing to go out with me as Catechists and who will be ready for Holy Orders before very long, I can speak in the highest terms, and I venture to recommend them in consequence of a similar arrangement being made by the Government in 1835”.

The three young men who went out with Dr. Polding in 1835 were H. G. Gregory, B. Spencer, and John Kenny. Dr. Willson pointed out that these had become useful clergymen in New South Wales.

The Bishop went on:

“Another reason which induces me to solicit assistance is this: Some friends who are pretty well acquainted with the state of the Colony believe that the provision for the Catholic population will bear no proportion to that of the Established Church of England and would therefore urge me to seek for assistance from Ireland. Now, this I am most desirous, if possible, to avoid, for many reasons. I hope it may be my lot to steer clear of all party feeling, and labour solely for the welfare of those who will have a claim upon my exertions”.

Lord Stanley consented to Father Bond's passage to the Colony 'in the anticipation that his services may be required there upon the Colonial Establishment'. He refused, however, to provide passages for the Catechists. Something had been gained; but it was then discovered that the Rev. Norbert Woolfrey had to cancel his proposed voyage. With the approval of the Secretary of State, Dr. Willson hastened to fill the vacancy. “With much exertion”, he wrote, “and through the kindness of his Bishop I have been so fortunate as to obtain the services of the Rev. John Taylor”. But he rejoiced too soon. Plans went askew once more:—

“South Audley Street,

“21st January, 1844.

"My Lord—I beg leave to offer a strong apology for the trouble I am giving Your Lordship; but this day I have been informed that there is a probability of Mr. Taylor not being able to go out with me to Van Diemen's Land.

"Might I therefore be permitted to ask as a favour that the Rev. James Levermore, who is not yet in Priest's Orders, *but who would be ordained priest as soon as we arrive in Van Diemen's Land* may have his name substituted for that of Mr. Taylor? I can speak in the most unqualified manner of the fitness and estimable qualities of Mr. Levermore. Permit me to add that I have engaged the berths for myself and three Clergymen in a ship that will leave Plymouth the latter part of this week fully calculating upon the services of Mr. Taylor; and that if Mr. Levermore did not accompany me I should not only be obliged to lose a most estimable clergyman, but also a part of the passage money I have advanced to the shipowners.

"Under the circumstances I trust, Your Lordship will be pleased to grant my request.

"I have the honour, etc.,

"R. W. WILLSON".

Lord Stanley having assented to this arrangement all was ready for the voyage.

The Town Clerk of Nottingham sent a message of farewell:

"I will not let you leave the shores of England without sending you my best and truest good wishes and assuring you of my true affection. May you be the means of all the good to your poorest outcast fellow creatures which your kindness and firmness so encourage us to expect; and may the recollection of you stir us up to some deeds of self sacrifice and benevolence and if it please Heaven may we live to renew our friendship in future years".

The Catholic people, too, presented an address:

"Before your final departure from amongst us, permit us to express our gratitude for the many benefits we have received from you. But, reverend father, where shall we find words to express our feelings? How can we make known to you our excessive grief? Shall we adopt the language of sons about to lose for ever the most kind and indulgent father? And, in truth, so it is! For in holy and prudent counsel, in loving restraint, in ardent affection, in personal sacrifice for the welfare of your spiritual children, no father could surpass you; and we know that one of your greatest trials at this moment is the parting from us,

your unworthy but still beloved flock. We had hoped that the venerable head of the Christian Church would listen to the powerful appeal which was made to retain you amongst us, in which we joined our humble voices; and indeed, it appears that he was graciously pleased to do so, but an application having been made for your re-appointment, no subsequent efforts were sufficient to cancel your election. Yet, dear father, as we are convinced that it is your only study to know and obey the will of Almighty God, we derive some little consolation from the fact that throughout the whole of the proceedings for your advancement to the dignity of bishop, the will of God has been to all human appearance so manifest as not to leave us the slightest doubt what ought to be our conduct under this distressing bereavement. Yes, dear and honoured Sir, we will endeavour to imitate the true Catholic spirit that has actuated you on this trying occasion, and will submit to this evident manifestation of the Divine will with as much Christian fortitude as God in his mercy shall vouchsafe us. Yours, we know, will be an arduous task, for to build up a nation of good christians from the outcasts of society can not be accomplished without untiring zeal. Your mission is to the most wretched portion of mankind, but here christian charity presents itself to comfort us, because you are taking all the consolations of religion to the relief of suffering humanity. And as all the members of Christ's church should sympathise deeply with each other, we feel it our duty to make the sacrifice, bitter as it is, without repining.

"Dearest and most affectionate father in Christ excuse this imperfect attempt to express our feelings towards you, for we have chosen this homely style rather than cramp the free expression of our overflowing hearts.

"And now, dear father, we have one request to make, which is, that when you stand before the altar of God you will sometimes remember us, your unworthy though affectionate children. And be sure that on our parts when we assemble in the beautiful chapel which your pious zeal has erected, or in the glorious church of St. Barnabas—that noble monument of your zeal and perseverance,—we shall never forget the holy priest who raised them for us. And when the angel of God shall have summoned you from this vale of tears, our children will still cherish the memory of him who conferred so many blessings on their fathers, the fruits of whose labours and beneficence will endure for many generations. And may the Giver of all good pour upon you every blessing in this world; in a long and useful life may you see abundant fruit from

your labours in the distant land to which you are going ; and when these labours are ended may He crown you with everlasting glory”.

In the last week of January, 1844, the chosen band boarded the *Bella Marina*. The company was made up of the Bishop ; Fathers W. Hall and W. P. Bond ; the Rev. James Luke Levermore, soon to be raised to the priesthood ; and George Hunter, a student who had begun his ecclesiastical studies. The long sea trip was devoid of any unusual incident. The city of Hobart came into view on May 11th as night was falling. Dr. Willson, with the two priests, went ashore and found their way to Saint Joseph’s Church. Here they met the Rev. J. J. Therry, up till then acting as Archbishop Polding’s Vicar-General and representative in Van Diemen’s Land. Next morning, which was Sunday, Dr. Willson took possession of his diocese. The occasion was not marked by any particular ceremony or demonstration, no preparations having been made for the reception of the Bishop.

(To be continued)

JOHN H. CULLEN.

"Created Actuation by the Uncreated Act"

REFLECTIONS ON THE THEORY OF FATHER MAURICE DE LA
TAILLE, S.J.

Summary:

Section 1: *The Problem of the Supernatural*:—

Solution in the field of efficient causality—advantages—disadvantages
—explanation in the category of formal causality—advantages—disadvantages.

Section 2: *De la Taille's Solution*:—

A) His hypothesis:—

Actuation—information—created actuation by the uncreated Act.

B) Verification of the hypothesis:—

1. Beatific Vision;
2. Justification—special difficulties and de la Taille's solution;
3. Hypostatic Union.

PART I: EXPOSITORY.

Section I: *The Problem*.

De la Taille's theory¹ of "created actuation by the uncreated Act" is based on, is the explanation of, his concept of the supernatural. For him the supernatural is an immediate union between God and the creature in the line of Act and Potency. To appraise at its true worth his theory, it is necessary, I think, to realise the problem that confronts the theologian of the supernatural.

In strict theological language the term "supernatural"² is applied

¹This theory is adumbrated in: "Mysterium Fidei"; Paris; 1921; pgs. 514-515. (Same pages in the third edition). It is applied quite fully to the Hypostatic Union in: "The Incarnation; Papers from the Summer School of Catholic Studies held at Cambridge, July, 1925"; pages 152-190. The full flowering of the synthesis comes in "Recherches de Science Religieuse"; Février-Avril, 1928; pages 253-269: "Actuation créée par acte incréé". Criticisms levelled at de la Taille are discussed in the parts of a long dialogue-article in "Revue Apologétique"; vol. XLVIII; 1929; pgs. 5-27 & 129-146: "Entretien Amical d'Eudoxe et de Palamède sur la Grâce d'Union". Other articles, such as "Théories Mystiques à propos d'un livre récent ..." (in Recherches de S.R.; 1928; pgs. 297-326), shed light on individual points.

Besides these articles from de la Taille's own pen, other writers have given quite full accounts of de la Taille's theory:

W. R. O'Connor: "A new Concept of Grace and the Supernatural"; The Ecclesiastical Review; Philadelphia; 1938; pgs. 401-14.

M. Donnelly: "The Theory of R. P. Maurice de la Taille, S.J., on the Hypostatic Union"; Theological Studies; New York; 1941; pages 510-527.

"The Inhabitation of the Holy Spirit. A Solution according to de la Taille"; Theological Studies; 1947; pgs. 445-471.

M. Retailleau: "La Sainte Trinité dans les Ames justes"; Thèse pour le Doctorat présentée à la Faculté de Théologie de l'Université Catholique d'Angers; 1932.

²On the meaning of "supernatural" see particularly:

de Broglie: "de Fine Ultimo Humanae Vitae"; Paris; 1948; pgs. 141-163;

Rondet: "Gratia Christi: Essai d'Histoire duc Dogme et de Théologie Dogmatique"; Paris; 1948;

de Lubac: "Surnaturel; Etudes Historiques"; Paris; 1946; pgs. 322-429.

Hugo Rahner: "Der spielende Mensch"; Zürich, 1949.

above all to the life of the justification here on earth, to the life of glory hereafter, and to the Hypostatic Union of Christ Our Lord. Immediately a problem thrusts itself forward: How can 'supernatural' be applied to the life of the just man here and of the Blessed in Heaven. Their ways are poles apart. *HERE* the just man is a wayfarer, stumbling and blundering, ringed around by a hundred dangers, dragged to earth by cravings that are the aftermath of Original Sin, all too tragically ready to give the kiss of Judas. *THERE*, 'in patria', all is calm and unalloyed joy for the Blessed, a haven where no storm comes.

Yet though it is not easy to see how both these states must be qualified as 'supernatural', though their 'supernaturality' is hard to define—nevertheless there is at least this in common, that in either case the disposition that elevates is an accidental form: Sanctifying Grace and 'Lumen Glorior'. But when you cross the threshold of the Hypostatic Union, the difficulty is enhanced a hundredfold. Here you have the human nature of Christ united, in no mere accidental union but in the substantial order, with the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity. What definition of 'supernatural' can be broad enough to include this unique and matchless Union?

Not only must the theologian formulate a definition of the supernatural that will extend at least to these three cases where all admit that we have the supernatural in the strictest sense; he must also so define it as to mark it off adequately against the natural order. And this is a delicate and thorny problem.

Roughly speaking, theologians who are searching for a definition of the supernatural must choose one of two categories of causality—that of efficiency or that of formal or quasi-formal causality. On this they would be in substantial agreement. The supernatural implies some new presence or union with God; and to explain this one must invoke efficiency or formal causality.³

³Tromp (in 'Textus et Documenta'; Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana; 26; pg. 132, n. 3) neatly and scientifically phrases the question thus: "num explicari possit ac debeat (unio scilicet supernaturalis) unice ex *ANALOGIA* causalitatis efficientis, vel etiam ratio haberi debeat *ANALOGIAE* causalitatis formalis?"

I wish to put on record here once for all that nowhere throughout these two articles do I lose sight of the law of analogy. In these difficult matters I am not blind to the dangers, to the treachery, of human language. But I trust that the reader will not confuse the radical insufficiency of human words when applied to things divine with intellectual misapprehensions. I do not forget the warning of the present Holy Father; nowhere do I admit that creatures. "ita...in divina perperam invadant ut vel una sempiterni Numinis attributio de iisdem tamquam propria praedicari queat". (Acta Apostolicae Sedis; 1943; pg. 231).

If you choose the field of efficiency, you have this immediate and momentous advantage, that God's unstainable transcendence is fully safeguarded. The axiom, "*Agens in quantum agens, non mutatur*", which is true of all efficient causes as such, is realized in its perfection only in God, the First Cause.⁴ If then in the supernatural order he acts only as Efficient Cause, his transcendence necessarily remains unsullied; he contracts no dependence; he suffers no limitations.

Besides this advantage there are others. At least from one angle the created supernatural realities of Grace and '*Lumen glorie*' are readily explained if God is regarded as the Efficient Cause producing these created dispositions. They will be special participations in his own infinite excellence and in his divine life. Moreover, have we not in the natural order clear indications of how intimately present to his creatures God can be when he is acting towards them as Efficient Cause? Even in the natural order he is everywhere and in everything. If in the supernatural order he acts in a special way, why should it be so hard to admit a new and special intimacy of presence—and this without going outside the field of efficiency?

However, these real advantages are offset by serious disadvantages. To begin with, efficient causality is essentially one of opposition. It is, of course, true that there is always resemblance between cause and effect:—

"*effectus praeexistit virtute in causa agente*";
 "*agens agit simile sibi*".⁵

But always between effect and cause there is separation, there is division; union is lacking.

"From whatever angle you look at cause and effect, you will find terms that are opposed. And it cannot be otherwise, for they are the two terms of a relation".

"Take two entities, one of which act on the other. The first is active; better: acting, AGENT. The second is passive; better: undergoing action, PATIENT. The first produces the effect, the second receives it. The entities in which cause and effect are lodged are in opposition, under the relation of causality".⁶

Now to explain the supernatural it is imperative to have a principle of union, not of division. So, though God's transcendence is excellently accounted for in efficiency, not so the union which the supernatural seems to bespeak.

⁴cf. Théodore de Régnon: "*La Métaphysique des Causes*"; Paris; 1906; 3/2/pgs. 152-165. Also J. de Finance: "*Etre et Agir*"; Paris; 1945; pgs. 250-255.

⁵cf. de Régnon, op. cit.; pgs. 182-194 and 194-200.

⁶de Régnon, op. cit.; pg. 138. Translation mine—here and in other places.

Again, it is not enough to be able to show that God is *present* to his creatures, or that they are participations of his Being. The supernatural implies more than just presence of God, even that penetrating presence of the First Cause. It means more than participation in God's perfections. It means both possession of God and communication of God's self to the creature. As de la Taille puts it:—

"Stones do not possess God, although God is presented to them as First Cause. But he is not there as the term of a union, as an act lodged in a potency. Strictly speaking, participation (μετοχή) is not communication (κοινωνία). God communicates himself, God gives himself only to the soul of the just, as such, though materially or immaterially the whole of creation is a participation of him. Everything is stamped with some *likeness* to his perfections. Only the just are made *associates* in his nature and his life".⁷

Along the line, therefore, of efficiency it seems hard to give a satisfactory account of the union with God, the possession of God, that the supernatural seems to imply. Moreover, it is extremely difficult to mark off adequately the natural from the supernatural if one invokes nothing beyond efficiency for the supernatural.⁸

If one chooses the category of formal causality, immediate advantages accrue.⁹ No longer are you faced with any difficulty in accounting for that intimacy of union and presence in which consists the possession of God. This category of causality is 'par excellence' the category of union. Nor will it be hard to understand how there is communication, as distinct from participation; for in formal causality, the function of the form is precisely self-communication. Consequently in this category of causality it will be easy to mark off the supernatural from the natural.

⁷Recherches de Science Religieuse; 1928; "Théories Mystiques.." pg. 321.

⁸It will always be remembered that efficiency can never be jettisoned from the supernatural. As Rudloff says:—

"In *allen* Dingen ist Gott wie die Ursache in den Wirkungen—und insofern ist diese Art für *alle* anderen Arten Voraussetzung". (Divus Thomas; Frib.; 1930; pg. 184).

His words are only the echo of S. Thomas:

"In quo enim est Deus per unionem, etiam est per gratiam: et in quo est per gratiam, est per essentiam, praesentiam et potentiam... Illi tres modi (per essentiam, scilicet, praesentiam et potentiam) OMNEM creaturam consequuntur, et PRAESUPPONUNTUR etiam in aliis modis". (In I Sent. 37/1/2/3).

⁹Galtier (in "de SS. Trinitate in Se et in Nobis"; Paris; 1933; pg. 288; n.

413) notes:—

"Propterea communior est in dies sententia, quae tenet specialem illam in anima habitationem esse de ratione causae formalis justificationis nostrae.."

Yet here too the theologian is hedged about with difficulties. If God comes to the creature-potency as Form or Act, will not his transcendence be compromised? Is not every Form both limited by its potency and dependent on it? You will answer that God is not a Form, but a quasi-Form.¹⁰ But is not this to save a dangerous position just with a word? What metaphysical explanation can be forthcoming that would allow one to reap from the category of formal causality its many advantages and at the same time safeguard the "schlechthinnige Transzendenz und Unveränderlichkeit" of God?

It is here that there is room for de la Taille's solution. Like many theologians, he cannot rest satisfied with efficiency as an explanation of the supernatural.¹¹ And he offers a metaphysical explanation of the supernatural that belongs to the field of formal causality, but is marked off from it in that no unhappy consequences spring up against God's transcendence. This, then, is the setting of de la Taille's theory and solution: an attempt to explain the supernatural, to define it in its three capital manifestations of Grace, Glory and Hypostatic Union; to define it in such a way that the definition will easily apply to the three different cases and also will mark off clearly the essence of the supernatural from all that is merely natural. It is an attempt that is deliberately made in the field of formal, not of efficient, causality. But the nature of formal causality is analysed in masterly fashion, so that, without trespass to his Absoluteness, God can be said to actuate a creature-potency.

Section II: A) The Hypothesis; B) Its Verification.

A) The Hypothesis.

¹⁰What does this "quasi" mean? Karl Rahner (in his article: "Zur Scholastischen Begrifflichkeit der Ungeschaffenen Gnade"; *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie*; 1939; pg. 147) says that the "quasi" means—

"dass diese 'forma' trotz ihrer formalen Ursächlichkeit, die wirklich ernst genommen werden muss, in ihrer absoluten Transzendenz—Unberührtheit, 'Freiheit'—verbleibt".

¹¹De la Taille not only does not EXCLUDE efficiency, but expressly states that he INCLUDES it and presupposes it to his explanation. For example, he writes:

"...La présence de Dieu par opération est essentiellement présupposée à la présence de Dieu par communication..." (*Recherches*; 1928; pg. 264).

However, he insists that the relation of effect to efficient cause is not enough. (Cf. *Revue*...; 1929; pg. 133). He goes further. Unless you invoke something beyond efficiency, you undermine the transcendence of the supernatural:—

"...à vouloir exclure toute possibilité de ce genre (that is to say, an explanation in the category of quasi-formal causality) on ruinerait par la base la transcendence propre du surnatural" (*Recherches*; 1928; pg. 262).

Cfr. Donnelly in *Theological Studies*; 1941; pg. 521.

De la Taille's solution to the problem of the supernatural, his theory of created actuation by the Uncreated Act, swings around his careful analysis of information and its distinction from pure actuation.¹² He begins by defining his terms—act, potency, actuation. Act implies perfection. If a being IS its perfection, you have Pure Act. If there is a subject which HAS perfection ADDED to it, you have a potency in the subject which receives; and the act is then that which, by self-communication, perfects the potency. Join act and potency and the potency is called 'actuated'. Actuation is, therefore,

"the communication of the act to the potency, or correlatively, the reception of the act in the potency; it is the perfecting of the latter by the former; a bettering, a changing, not of the act, but of the potency".¹³

Next step: *actuation* is styled *information* whenever the act is dependent on the potency, in whatsoever way—

"either for its existence, for example, the soul of the lion; or at least for the integration of its characteristic faculties, for example the human soul".¹³

When there is this dependence, the act is not merely a giver; it is also a receiver. Of what?

"What it receives is not a perfection, but either a necessary prop, or else a subject that is the counterpart to its own perfection. There is a reciprocity of services, an exchange of resources, howsoever unequal they be. There is mutual indebtedness, interdependence. This is what is meant by the terms—formal and material causality. The potency is then called matter, the act is called form and the actuation of one by the other is called information. In the natural order, all actuation is information".¹⁴

Third step: a question:—is actuation always information? Is it possible to find anywhere an actuation that will be pure, that will be shorn of the imperfections that attend on all actuation in the natural order? De la Taille answers by an hypothesis: Suppose God himself discharges the rôle of Act to a creature-potency. There you would have pure actuation, actuation that would not be, could not be, also information. Impossible for the Uncreated Act in any slightest fashion to depend on a creature. He would give and only give. Nothing, absolutely nothing, would he receive. Hence, were this hypothesis to be

¹²This analysis is to be found in the opening pages of the *Recherches*—article; 1928; pgs. 253 ff. Donnelly (*Theol. Studies*; 1941; pg. 511): "And now we come to the heart of the theory—the difference between INFORMATION and PURE ACTUATION".

¹³*Recherches*; 1928; pg. 253.

¹⁴*ibid*, pg. 254.

verified, the creature-potency would not be a material cause, nor would the Act be a formal cause in the strict sense of the term. No material cause, no formal cause—neither, therefore, would you have a formal effect in the strict sense. What would you have? Communication of the Act to the potency; reception of the Act in the potency; “perfectionnement de la puissance par l’Acte, amélioration, mutation”. This “change” would not be a figment of the mind, it would be a tangible reality. It could not be the Act himself, utterly changeless. It could not be identical with the potency, which is its subject, which, consequently, it actuates. But it is a created reality, existing in the potency:

“the potency’s infused adaptation to the Act. But at the same time it is the actuation of the potency by the Act; therefore created actuation by the uncreated Act”.¹⁴

B) Verification of Hypothesis:

Enough for de la Taille’s hypothesis. How is it verified? Rather, where is it verified?

De la Taille applies his theory to three cases—Beatific Vision, Grace and the Indwelling of the Holy Ghost, the Hypostatic Union.

Take the first case, that of the Beatific Vision, where the restless soul at last finds rest in God,

“not only God himself, but God such as he cannot be, God giving himself freely, in the initiative of his pure love”.¹⁵

Revelation promises to the persevering Just the Vision of God; and the authentic voice of the Church declares splendidly that in Heaven the Blessed will see God,

“visione intuitiva et etiam faciali, nulla mediante creatura in ratione objecti visi se habente, sed divina essentia immediate se nude, clare et aperte eis ostendente”.¹⁶

To see God ‘sicuti est’ can mean only an immediate union between the intellect and God. No created species would be adequate to mediate this union. God himself must come immediately to the intellect, if he is to be seen as he really is. Hence a union in act and potency between God and the human intellect. But for this union the created intellect must be adapted, elevated, disposed. All that, too, will be the work of the uncreated Act:—

“Thus is the hypothesis realised: God becomes the Act of a created potency. Therefore there is in this case created actuation by the uncreated Act. Therefore there is a created adaptation of the intellect fitting it for the uncreated Act. This adaptation or dis-

¹⁴ibid. pg. 254.

¹⁵De Lubac: “Surnaturel”; Paris; 1946; pg. 484.

¹⁶Constitutio—‘Benedictus Deus’; Jan. 1336; Benedictus XII; cf. Denzinger-Umberg; n. 530.

position infused into the mind is what you call the 'lumen gloriae'. It is an immediate disposition for the Act, and therefore not antecedent, but brought about by the Act himself. Indeed it is nothing but the communication of the Act to the potency, or the reception in the potency; 'amélioration de la puissance par l'acte, association de la puissance à l'Acte'.¹⁷

De la Taille adds that his teaching is the same of S. Thomas in *Contra Gentiles* 3/53.¹⁸

The second verification of his hypothesis, de la Taille finds in Justification. To appreciate the brilliance of de la Taille's theory at this point, you must glance at the peculiar difficulties of the problem of the grace-life and re-birth of man.

Justification consists of two factors, one created, the other uncreated; one is called Sanctifying Grace, the other the Indwelling of the Holy Ghost. From Revelation we are absolutely certain of the existence of both elements. Holy Scripture tells us of both, more emphatically, however, of the Indwelling.¹⁹ And it is this Uncreated Element that is particularly dear to the Greek Fathers. The Reformers challenged the intrinsic nature of the created element, and, during that struggle and since, Theologians have naturally underlined Sanctifying Grace. Modern Theology, enlightened by the experience of history, regards as beyond cavil ('als eine Selbstverständlichkeit') the fact that—

"both created and uncreated Grace belong to our supernatural life. Both factors are found, though differently, in the theological sources. A theory that could find no room for, or even somewhat underrate the worth of, either of them, must be jettisoned as uncatholic".²⁰

And here is the pith of the problem: Revelation, while assuring you of

¹⁷Recherches...; 1928; pg. 255.

¹⁸ibid.; pg. 255. Again, pg. 257:—

"Tout ceci nous est enseigné par saint Thomas".

"Il n'y a pas d'erreur possible sur la pensée de saint Thomas: elle confirme tout ce que nous avions dit plus haut, sur la question générale de l'actuation d'une puissance créée par un Acte incréé".

¹⁹Karl Rahner (in *Zeitschrift für Kath. Theol.*; 1939; pgs. 137) says vigorously about S. Paul:—

"Was zunächst die Paulinische Theologie angeht, so ist die innere Rechtfertigung und Erneuerung des Menschen zunächst und in erster Linie gesehen als Begabtheit, Bewohnt—und Getriebensein durch das πνεῦμα ἅγιον

Der 'Geist' ist (wohnt) in uns ..., und zwar wie in einem Tempel. Wir sind mit dem 'Geist' getränkt, gesalbt und gesigelt..."

²⁰J. Beumer in *Wissenschaft und Weisheit*; 1943; pgs. 22-42:—

"Geschaffene Gnade und ungeschaffene Gnade gehören zusammen zum übernatürlichen Leben. Beide Faktoren ergeben sich wenn auch auf verschiedene Weise, aus den theologischen Quellen. Eine Vorstellung, die einen von ihnen ausschliesse oder seinen Wert nicht voll und ganz anerkennen wollte, müsste als unkatholisch abgelehnt werden". (Page 35).

Cf. Scheeben; *Handbuch der Katholischen Dogmatik*; Freiburg im Breisgau; 1878; vol. 2; pg. 382; n. 878ff.

the existence of these two factors, gives scant guidance as to their inter-relations. What theory is able to accommodate both co-efficients while prejudicing the place of neither? Thus, for example, if you stress the created element, you turn your mind from one of the richest and most consoling doctrines of our Faith, and you are faced with a very serious difficulty. If, to the neglect of the Indwelling, you urge that created, Sanctifying Grace implies, indeed formally IS, that sharing in the divine nature, the divine life of which St. Peter, the Church herself and her Theologians speak,²¹ immediately arises the objection: "Impossible. Nothing merely created, situated in, belonging to, the finite order of being, can make us formally to be sharers in God's own life".

"Why the very expression, 'CREATED GRACE', shows you clearly that we deal with something belonging to the creature-order. How, then, can this Grace confer on men a sharing in the very nature of God, and a likeness with God that goes right beyond the created order? How can it make us children of God and endow us with the other privileges of the state of Grace?.... Is it possible that a created ACCIDENT, such as grace, should elevate us not only above the grade of human existence, but beyond that of all created being?"²²

On the other hand, if you stress the Indwelling, all too easily you

²¹² Pet. 1/4. Hardly less loved than S. Peter's famous words are those of the greatest of his successors, St. Leo the Great:—

"Agnosce, o Christiane, dignitatem tuam et divinae consors factus naturae, noli in veterem vilitatem degeneri conversatione redire". (Migne. P.L.; 54/192/C).

Likewise St. Augustine:—

"Descendit ille ut nos ascenderemus, et manens in natura sua factus est particeps naturae nostrae ut nos manentes in natura nostra efficeremur participes naturae ipsius" (Epist. 140/10; Migne P.L. 33/542).

Cf. the Offertory of every Mass, the Preface of the Ascension, the Secret of the 4th Sunday after Easter.

Suarez (Disp. 18/Sec. 2 of tome XVII; 584/A/8—Vivès) has a striking remark:—

Gratia sanctificans, quae in nobis est, est suprema quaedam participatio divinae naturae, qua fortasse nulla potest esse maior per qualitatem creatam, cum non possit habere operationes connaturales meliores quam sint visio et amor supernaturalis Dei".

Cf. too Oddone: "I problemi della Grazia Divina"; Milan, 1937; pg. 114 and 115.

²²Beumer: "Das Verhältnis von geschaffener und ungeschaffener Gnade"; Wissenschaft und Weisheit; 1943; pg. 36. The last sentence, of which in the text I have given the sense rather than a literal translation, runs thus:—

"Es ist...nicht einzusehen, dass durch ein geschaffenes Anderssein (accidens), wie es die heiligmachende Gnade besagt, eine Seinsstufe erreicht werden soll, die nicht nur über wen konkreten Menschen, sondern über jedes beschaffene Sein, auch das bloss denkbare und rein mögliche, hinausgeht (Supernaturale simpliciter)".

See Galtier; "de SS. Trinitate..."; pg. 287; n. 412. Interesting quotation from St. Cyril of Alexandria.

undermine the position of created grace. For if all the wonderful effects of the grace-life in us are to be assigned to the abiding presence of the "dulcis Hospes animae", why is created grace necessary? Does it not become superfluous? You know, of course, that it is necessary and NOT superfluous; but you know that *dogmatically*. As a scientific theologian how can you show its necessity?

This is no imaginary difficulty. Petavius, for example, gives no convincing account of the necessity of the created element. Hence he could write:

"If no created quality is infused in the soul, the Holy Ghost himself, by his own substance, would make us adoptive sons".²³

Beumer, a modern theologian who has given special care to the study of the relations between created and uncreated Grace, declares that after all God could, by almighty power, dispense with the created disposition that Sanctifying Grace is.²⁴ Neither of these theologians could claim to account for the metaphysical exigence for Sanctifying Grace.

Now look at de la Taille's position. You will see that it must be regarded here at least as nothing short of triumphant.

The uncreated Element, the Indwelling is for him the uncreated Act. The created element, Sanctifying Grace, is the created actuation. The created actuation from the Uncreated Act is a solution that does full justice to both created and uncreated Grace. At the same time, it suggests convincingly how by an element that is created we can be said to be formally sharers in God's nature.

The excellence of this theory is that it meets so happily the difficulties. The Indwelling of the Holy Ghost is accounted for most satisfactorily in the uncreated Act. At the same time, created grace is not thrown into shadow, being the created actuation, the union with the Act, the self-communication of the Act as received in the creature-potency. On de la Taille's theory the suggestion that created grace could be superfluous is quite absurd. It is necessary, metaphysically necessary; it is the inevitable counterpart to the active actuation of the uncreated Act. De la Taille could never say what the looser theories of Petavius and Beumer allow them to say; he could not say what they say, precisely

²³Petavius' words:—

"Si nulla infunderetur creata qualitas, sua nos ipse (Spiritus scilicet Sanctus) substantia adoptivos filios efficeret". Vivès; vol. 3; 483/A/III).

²⁴Beumer's words:—

"Wir können nicht behaupten, dass es (i.e. das geschaffene Element) absolut notwendig in dieser Weise geschieht, weil Gott in seiner unumschränkten Herrschaft über alles Sein auch ohne jegliche Disposition in Kreatürlichen eingreifen kann". (op. cit.; pg. 37).

because his theory is far more perfectly articulated and metaphysically more profound. For him passive necessarily follows active actuation. And as the passive is necessarily created, the very hypothesis of God's actuating demands, 'ipso facto', a passive actuation that is created grace. Hence in his theory are catered for Sanctifying Grace's strict necessity, and its real, but not exclusive, place in Justification.

The third application of his theory is the Hypostatic Union. De la Taille subscribes to the Capreolus-theory on the formal constituent of personality. In the application of his hypothesis of created actuation by the uncreated Act, and in the building up of his synthesis, he presupposes the conclusions of Capreolus, given a new lease of life through the able pens of Billot and Terrien, and to-day supported by many theologians of high quality.²⁵

De la Taille's own exposition and defence of this theory, in his Cambridge lecture, is unrivalled. He states the problem of the Hypostatic Union with penetrating cogency, and proceeds to consider and criticise most damagingly the solutions of Scotus and Tiphanius, Suarez and Cajetan. Next he defends Capreolus' solution and his definition of personality as,

"precisely identical with the possession itself of a connatural existence".²⁶

On this theory of Capreolus he erects his own scheme of created actuation by the uncreated Act. The Second Person of the Blessed Trinity communicates himself to the human nature; communicates his own existence. The communication is in time, but he is beyond time. There is a created communication, created actuation, coming from the uncreated Act. The human nature, stripped of its own connatural principle of existence, is not a person;

"to this humanity the divine existence is communicated as an actual principle of being, instead of the formal principle of existence which normally ought to be its own".²⁷

However, this case is different from the two previously considered. There the created actuation was an accident, a quality. Here, declares de la Taille, the created actuation is substantial. This de la Taille affirms not once only, nor 'obiter'. It is a point he emphasises and re-

²⁵Cf. Boyer; de Verbo Incarnato; Rome; 1948; pg. 109. Fr. Boyer, who is himself a distinguished follower of Capreolus' theory, lists out these names of others:—

Pègues, Welshen, degl'Innocenti, Mattiussi, Janssens, Michel, d'Alès, Parente, van Noort.

Noteworthy is degl'Innocenti's strong article: 'Il Capreolo e la questione della personalità'; Divus Thomas; Plac.; 1940; pg. 27-40.

²⁶Cambridge Lecture; pg. 174-175.

²⁷ibid. pg. 183.

peats, and it must therefore be regarded as capital in his mind.²⁸ It was particularly on this head that many critics joined issue with him. In the "*Revue Apologetique*", where he answers his critics—what does he say on this point? Does he withdraw? Palamède (his mouthpiece) speaks unequivocally:—

This actuation "is of the substantial order, without being a substance or a part of a substance; just as your own existence is substantial, although it is neither you nor anything of you, but is merely the actuation of your own essence looked at as a substantial potency for existence".²⁹

De la Taille did not abandon his position because it drew the fire of the enemy.

We have studied briefly de la Taille's theory of created actuation and uncreated Act; we have seen his hypothesis and its application and verification. Immediately the splendour of this synthesis of three great theological peaks reaches the mind and attracts. Though it is not entirely original and draws on old ideas,³⁰ one can understand why Retailliau describes it as being of the different theories on this matter,

²⁸Clear statement in the Cambridge Lecture, pg. 184; two years later the same thought ventilated with undiminished force in *Recherches*...; 1928; pgs. 260-261.

²⁹*Revue Apol.*; 1929; pg. II. It is worth quoting here de la Taille's own words. The actuation, he says:

"est de l'ordre substantiel, sans être substance ni partie de substance: tout comme est substantielle votre propre existence, bien qu'elle ne soit ni vous ni rien de vous, mais seulement une actuation de votre propre essence en qualité de puissance substantielle à l'être".

³⁰In the attempt to handle the problems of created and uncreated Grace by a recourse to the field of quasi-formal causality, de la Taille has many forerunners, the most noteworthy of whom are Lessius, Petavius, and Scheeben. However, from all of these, de la Taille differs on major points—and the differences are in his favour. His originality is to be sought in the metaphysical dress in which he has arrayed some of the older ideas; in the deepening of the solution; in the superb clarity and conciseness of his theory; in the emphatic application to the three peaks of the supernatural. Yes, de la Taille's originality lies above all in the synthesis of his ideas, in their articulation, in their presentation in such a felicitous formula: 'Actuation créée par acte incréée'. The synthesis, the orchestration—these are the strokes of a master:—

"Il était difficile de dire tant de choses, et si compliquées, en si peu de mots. L'étude est d'un maître, et l'on se laisse prendre, en la lisant, à cette lumière sereine et puissante".

(Bainvel's words about de la Taille's theory of mystical prayer, in his introduction to the 10th edition of Poulain's "*Des Grâces d'Oraison*"; Paris; 1922; pg. LIX. In the *Revue Apol.*; 1929; page 134, one can read de la Taille's own, very modest, concept of his originality in this theory of created actuation by the uncreated Act).

"la plus fière, la plus philosophique, le plus parfaite expression".³¹
³¹"La Sainte Trinité dans les Ames justes"; pg. 140.

J. P. KENNY, S.J.

Moral Theology

MEMBERS OF THE LEGAL PROFESSION AND CIVIL DIVORCE.

Dear Rev. Sir,

A man whose wife is making a claim for maintenance against him is recommended by his solicitor to institute proceedings for Divorce on the grounds of desertion. May a Catholic solicitor give such advice and encourage parties, whether Catholic or non-Catholic, to take such action, especially in view of the requirements of the IV Plenary Council of Australia? A short statement on the duties of legal men would, I believe, be of help to the clergy.

PERPLEXUS.

REPLY.

In view of the widespread publicity given recently to some reported pronouncements of His Holiness Pope Pius XII, which touch on this matter, we may be pardoned if we do not altogether confine our reply to the short statement suggested by our correspondent. Let us first answer the questions proposed, and in the course of the explanations we may hope to satisfy the desire for an exposition of the principles involved.

1. A Catholic solicitor may advise and encourage divorce proceedings and also plead for his client, when the parties are justified in seeking the divorce. The reason is that the solicitor is the legal representative of his client and may act on his behalf before the Law in all that is within the rights of the client. In the case of a Catholic client, it is forbidden to approach the civil Courts for a divorce or even legal separation without the express permission of the Bishop. (Plenary Council dec. 472). The Bishop will not grant the permission unless the person concerned promises on oath not to contract another matrimonial union until the existing marriage is dissolved either by the death of the other party or a decree of nullity given in the competent ecclesiastical court. When the Bishop has sanctioned the proceedings for divorce in the civil courts, the Solicitor may, without hesitation, undertake a case for a Catholic client. Should he be approached before the Bishop has been acquainted of the intentions of the client, he would be justified in expressing his opinion on the merits of the case and promising to give his assistance if and when the requirements of the Church have been faith-

fully attended to. Non-Catholics obviously would not approach the Bishop for permission, although, if they are baptised, their marriage cases would be under the jurisdiction of the Church. We think that in circumstances where similar reasons would suffice to obtain the permission in the case of a Catholic client, the solicitor may act with presumed permission for the non-Catholic.

2. Outside the cases when the party is justified in obtaining a divorce, the solicitor cannot encourage his clients to institute the appropriate legal proceedings in the civil courts. To encourage others to evil is to consent to their sin and is formal co-operation. In any hypothesis to approach the civil tribunal for a matrimonial case over and above what may be described as the civil effects of marriage is a violation of the rights of the Church (Can. 1960), and to seek a divorce not merely *a mensa et toro* but *a vinculo* with the intention of entering another so-called marriage is opposed to the divine Law. The solicitor who encourages such proceedings shares in the grievous sin of his client.

3. If, notwithstanding his advice, the client persists in seeking a divorce, the solicitor who gives the aid of his legal knowledge and practice certainly co-operates in the sin. It seems to us that his co-operation is not necessarily formal but may be merely material, and so justifiable for sufficient cause.

The civil laws of divorce with which we are acquainted are unjust in the sense that the legislator has exceeded his authority in enacting and promulgating them. To institute tribunals to hear matrimonial cases between baptised persons is a usurpation of the rights of the Church, which are thus stated in can. 1960: "Matrimonial cases between baptised persons belong by proper and exclusive right to the ecclesiastical judge". Marriage between those who are baptised is a Sacrament; and Christ entrusted to the Church the custody of His sacraments and all that concerns their ministration and their essential effects. One of the essential effects of the marriage contract is the bond which is indissoluble by reason of the natural law and the positive divine law.

Once Christian marriage has been consummated it can be dissolved by no human authority; before consummation it may be dissolved by the use of the vicarious power of the Supreme Pastor, applied according to Law by solemn religious profession, and by dispensation in other cases where there is grave reason. In cases of doubt or dispute concerning the validity of the contract or the proper discharge of its mutual rights

and obligations the Church alone is competent. It is true that the civil authority has competency over those effects of the contract which come directly and immediately within its sphere of action, for instance the property rights of husband and wife or of the offspring, the insistence that the parents shall educate their children according to a standard considered necessary for the common good, or that a man shall support his wife according to the degree of comfort which befits her social status. All these and the like which come within the power of the State are civil effects of a marriage which already is presumed to be valid and to be recognised as such by the Almighty through His earthly representative, the Church. But the existence or non-existence of the marriage bond, its temporary and partial dissolution by legal separation, or complete annihilation by divorce in the strict sense: these are matters which pertain to the very essence of the sacramental contract and its fulfilment; and so are sacred things under the control of the Church, within the limits which Christ has assigned.

The conclusion is that all who take upon themselves to invoke the unjust laws of the State concerning Marriage necessarily approve of them, do an injury to the Church and are guilty of sin. All who approach a civil court with the intention of requesting an application of its usurped jurisdiction in matrimonial cases commit a sacrilege. It may be asked: How, then, can the Bishop be empowered by the laws of the Plenary Council to allow a matrimonial case to come before a civil judge sitting in matrimonial jurisdiction? The answer is that while the jurisdiction of the judge over the case as it affects the marriage itself is *ultra vires* and invalid, he has competency over the civil effects of the contract; and it precisely and exclusively concerning these that it is permitted to request and abide by this decree. For the sake of the good that is hoped for, the Church tolerates in certain instances what may appear to be a violation of her rights, without any intention of acknowledging the authority of the civil judge beyond what he has within the sphere of purely civil matters.

When the Church, through the local Ordinary, has agreed to an approach to the civil courts for the divorce, the parties and the solicitor can be content that the case is confined to the purely civil effects of the marriage. But if the permission has been refused by the Bishop, it will be because the essentials of the marriage are involved, or the reasons are not sufficient to justify the material violation of ecclesiastical rights

involved in an approach to a civil court functioning in matrimonial jurisdiction.

On the other hand, should the party instituting proceedings for divorce really intend a dissolution of the marriage bond by the decree of a civil judge, the case is far different. Here we have an attempt to solve what God has joined together and what no man may put asunder. It necessarily implies a violation of the divine and natural law, and cannot be justified. It goes without saying that the decree of the judge is invalid before God, and a subsequent matrimonial union attempted during the life-time of the former spouse is but concubinage with the protection of the civil law. The solicitor who is asked to secure such a divorce must in no way encourage the designs of his client; rather he would be bound in charity to do all he could to dissuade him from his sinful course. We may note that when the intention of the parties is to secure a dissolution of the valid marriage bond, our remarks have equal force whether the petitioners are Catholics or Protestants, Jews or Infidels, for all men are subject to the natural law, and any dispensation from it which was granted with regard to the indissolubility of Marriage under the old Dispensation has been revoked by our divine Lord. It would be a mistake for a Catholic solicitor to argue that as many Protestants and the others see no harm in divorce with a view to re-marriage, it would for that reason be lawful to assist them to obtain what they desire. The divorce is intrinsically evil. Good faith or invincible ignorance may excuse misinformed people from the guilt of formal sin; but the instructed person who consents to the evil is himself guilty of sin. The solicitor who would formally co-operate in securing a divorce *a vinculo* as it is technically understood in the civil law would be equally culpable before God, no matter what may be the religious convictions of his clients.

There are thus two reasons why it is not lawful to approach a civil court to petition for a divorce *a vinculo*: a) because all matrimonial cases should be tried before an ecclesiastical tribunal, and b) because such a divorce is contrary to the laws of God, and is in many instances but a preparation for a union which is irregular before the supreme Legislator and Judge.

What is the position of a Catholic solicitor who is approached with the request of a client to institute proceedings with a view to such a divorce? He knows or he soon learns that no amount of persuasion will

deter his client from his intentions. Is the Catholic solicitor bound in conscience to refuse the case with the consequent loss of business and perhaps of prestige among the members of the legal fraternity? The first question to be decided is: whether his actions in handling this case and bringing it through the court constitute formal co-operation in the sin of his client. If that be so, the case must be refused whatever be the consequences. Material co-operation in the sin of another can be lawful for sufficient reason; and so if the solicitor does not by his actions necessarily give approval to the divorce, then it may be possible to justify his acceptance of the divorce case.

At first sight it would seem that his co-operation is formal. What else can he intend but the application of the civil law as it stands? But the law clearly enough means to grant a complete dissolution of the marriage bond and will recognise as legally valid a subsequent union to which it grants the same rights and protection as it formerly gave to the previous marriage. Therefore, it may be reasoned, the solicitor who acts as the legal representative of his client in a petition which is contrary to the laws of God requests the court to grant what is an invasion of the divine rights and makes possible a bigamous marriage, which is a violation of the natural law. Knowing that all this is necessarily implied in a decree of divorce in civil law, how can it be maintained that the solicitor does not consent to the decree, and so to the sins that are involved therein?

Nevertheless, we believe that the co-operation of the solicitor is not necessarily formal. We say 'not necessarily', because he may indeed by an express act of his will approve of the divorce and all its consequences, but such approval, it seems, is not of itself contained in the actions of the solicitor who prepares the case, puts the process of law in motion, and is in a sense a cause of the granting of the decree. We mentioned above that some of the effects of the marriage contract were intrinsic, and over these no human authority has any power. Other effects, we also noted, are extrinsic; and these may come within the cognisance of either Church or State according as they pertain to the welfare of the Ecclesiastical or the Civil Society. The Church is not bound to give her recognition to every contract which is favoured so by the State; and as a matter of fact there are many unions which enjoy the legal status of true marriage in civil law which could not stand in canon law. Likewise there are valid marriages which the State will not recognise, to

which she will not concede the usual protection of the law and which she will not uphold in her courts. To grant the privileges of civil law in those matters which are within the sphere of the competency of the State to a union which is not a true marriage is not necessarily evil. And to refuse any longer to extend its positive protection and patronage in civil matters to a valid marriage may not in every case be wrong. Concubinage is not punishable by civil law, but bigamy is. Legal sons and daughters have certain rights which are not shared by illegitimate children. If the State should grant immunity against an action in its own courts for bigamy in certain cases, is it of necessity condoning bigamy? Not every sin against the Commandments, even when it affects the public morality, renders the offender liable to prosecution—fornication and adultery are patent examples. To grant to children whom the Church would class as illegitimate the same civil status and rights as belong to legal offspring may sometimes be justified. A 'de facto' wife (*sit venia verbo*) was frequently during the war given an allowance from her partner's service pay. The general effect on public morality may have been open to question, but who can say that some at least of these unfortunate women were not entitled to consideration?

The point we have endeavoured to bring out is that the decree of civil divorce purports to have two effects: it dissolves the existing marriage—and in this it is null and void, for it is not within the power of the State to break the marriage bond; secondly it produces certain legal effects in the civil sphere with regard to the existing marriage and any subsequent union that may be entered on. Thus it extinguishes a right to maintenance beyond any alimony which may be assigned by the court; subsequent children which may be born to the woman will not be considered as begotten by her husband and will have no right to a share in his estates, etc. Further, it grants immunity against proceedings for bigamy in the case of a new 'marriage' and recognises any children as enjoying the same rights and privileges as those born of the first union, it gives legal protection and right to support to the second 'wife' and so on. To grant these things is, we think, not always wrong. Some of them may be in particular instances desirable, and none of them is evil in itself. The solicitor in question says in effect to his client: "Marriage is a sacred contract ratified by God, and no earthly authority can dissolve it, no matter what be its pretensions. The Court will act as if it is really dissolving the marriage; but as the marriage is indissoluble.

I cannot agree to the suit in that respect. There are, however, certain legal aspects of marriage which are within the competency of the State, and these you are entitled to avail of. I will undertake to procure the advantage of the law in what concerns it: but for the rest I accept no responsibility". If such is known to be his mentality on the question, we think that he does not, in the petition that he presents, include anything more than what the Court may rightfully give; and with regard to the decree of divorce, he merely allows the unjust law to take its course which he indeed foresaw but did not intend. To help another to bring about an evil effect in a way that such is not intended either expressly as the *finis operantis* or implicitly as the necessary *finis operis* is material co-operation. Both the *finis operis* and the *finis operantis* (i.e., of the solicitor) is to procure a decree covering certain civil effects of marriage. The law which grants these pretends to go much further, but the solicitor did not make the law, and he does not wish it to apply further than it justly may. That it does so is not within his control. The client will abuse the decree to attempt a second union, but that is of his own free will and in no way dependent on the lawyer. Civil divorce in the sense that we restrict its application is not intrinsically evil, or the Church could never give permission for it in any circumstances. It is evil to intend and perpetrate a second 'marriage' which initiates a state of concubinage. By virtue of the decree of divorce such a sinful contract is immune to an action for the crime of bigamy; but the State is not bound to take action against bigamy, and in securing this immunity the solicitor does no more than free his client from the vexations of court proceedings and penal consequences. That he is determined on a life of sin is his own responsibility.

We are forbidden, however, to co-operate even materially in the sin of another without sufficient cause, and the solicitor who knows that after the decree of divorce there will be an attempt at marriage, must have some reason for the material assistance he provides. Such a reason, we think, would be the danger of loss of otherwise profitable clients, or serious detriment to his prestige among his legal colleagues. Further, if he refuses all divorce work, he may miss many an opportunity to reconcile the parties who otherwise would go to another solicitor who would proceed directly with the case.

Another aspect to be considered is whether the Catholic solicitor gives scandal in appearing in the divorce court. If it is known generally

that he is loyal to the doctrines of the Church and regards the divorce as restricted to civil effects of marriage, we do not think he causes any serious scandal. The public conscience in the locality would have to be taken into account and the advice of the local Ordinary could be sought and followed.

What has been written about the solicitor applies *mutatis mutandis* to the Judge in divorce. It is the duty of the Judge not to make the law but to apply it according to the process defined. If he cannot avoid it, he may grant the decree intending to effect only the civil effects of the marriage contract, and regarding the rest as an empty formula, a legality which has no actual application. Should the parties take advantage of the divorce in its full significance, that is the consequence of the law which he did not enact and cannot repeal. Like the solicitor, he is in this instance a material co-operator in the sin of the parties to the new contract, and so he needs a grave reason to permit him to act in divorce. Again, the local Ordinary will be the best to decide as to the existence of the reason and the absence of scandal.

Provided it is clearly understood that both judge and solicitor take the exercise of their functions as being restricted to the sphere of the civil effects of marriage, there does not appear to be a violation of the Church's jurisdiction. It must be also understood, that should the Ecclesiastical authorities forbid any part in the proceedings of the divorce courts to Catholic judges or lawyers, such prohibition would duly be obeyed.

A final remark is that modern States are becoming more and more material in their outlook and are gradually inclined to consider marriage, in so far as it concerns them, as a merely civil affair. Is it then too much to say that the Law nowadays considers divorce—in fact though not in theory—as little more than civil in its consequences, leaving the question of conscience to the individual and wishing directly to contradict the teachings of no religious body?

*

*

*

*

BURIAL OF A WELL-DISPOSED NON-CATHOLIC.

Dear Rev. Sir,

It happens sometimes here in Australia that, on account of the difference in religion, the parties of a mixed marriage have to be buried in different parts of the cemetery. Frequently, it is just one of those unavoidable results of the difference in religion, but it can be the

occasion of distress to the surviving partner and the family. Where the deceased non-Catholic was a staunch adherent of his own sect, there is no question of giving him the funeral rites of the Church, but at times we find that, though baptised in infancy by a non-Catholic minister, he took no part in any religious worship except perhaps when he accompanied his wife or children to the Catholic Church on extraordinary occasions. He kept faithfully the promises made at marriage and all his children are excellent Catholics. He dies without formally becoming a Catholic.

Can. 1239 states that all baptised persons are to be given ecclesiastical burial unless they are expressly deprived of it by law; and under that heading, as stated in the following canon come those who are notoriously affiliated to an heretical sect. I wonder, if in a case like that mentioned above, such a person could be said to be notoriously affiliated to the heretical sect. Would the priest be justified in burying him at least privately with the usual prayers at the grave-side, should the family request it?

HAESITANS.

REPLY.

1. We think that the Ordinary may tolerate the placing of the body of the deceased non-Catholic partner of a mixed marriage in the family grave of a Catholic cemetery, in an extreme case, i.e., if he is satisfied that in the circumstances the request cannot be refused without fear of scandal or greater evil.

2. A non-Catholic, who was publicly known as a practising member of an heretical religious organisation, could not be interred with the accompaniment of the Catholic funeral rites. If his remains were to be placed in the Catholic portion of the cemetery, there would be no religious ceremony.

3. A non-Catholic, such as described in the question submitted, certainly has no right to ecclesiastical burial; and we think he is excluded from it, so that the priest could not read the funeral service over his grave.

With regard to the burial of non-Catholic relatives in the family grave of a Catholic Cemetery, there was a reply of the Holy Office (30th March, 1859), from which we may gather that deceased non-Catholics, related by ties of blood or marriage may in some cases be placed in the family grave of Catholics. The words of the reply are: The Bishops are

to endeavour to the utmost to ensure the observance of the sacred canons; but if they cannot achieve this without scandal and danger, the burial may be tolerated. A further pronouncement of the Holy Office (4 Jan., 1888) stresses that such burials are given passive toleration to avoid greater evils. The greater evils are not specified, but they may be the fear of arousing hostility towards the Church or the estrangement of many from the Faith, etc. Mere relationship with the Catholic family is not enough to permit that the body be placed in the Catholic cemetery; there must be some extrinsic and serious reason.

The burial, with Catholic religious rites, of a non-Catholic, who was well-known as an active member of a Protestant sect, would be expressly forbidden by can. 1240, n. 1, in so much as he is notoriously a member of an heretical association.

The case of a well-disposed husband who took no interest in any form of religion—except a very passing interest in Catholicism, which could be explained by motives of natural affection—may present some difficulty. It is true that he is baptised, and the presumption is that the Sacrament administered by the minister of the sect was valid. Nevertheless, such a Baptism does not give him a right to ecclesiastical burial.¹ Baptism makes the recipient a member of the Church with the rights and obligations of a Christian, unless with regard to the rights, there is an obstacle—an impediment to ecclesiastical union or a censure inflicted by the Church. (Can. 87). Leaving aside the question of censure, the non-Catholic husband was not in communion with the Church. Though there is only one Baptism and all who receive it are born again of water and the Holy Ghost, the canonical effects of Baptism conferred by non-Catholics are not the same as those which follow from what we may call Catholic Baptism. The Code itself makes the distinction with regard to the impediment of Disparity of Cult (cf. can. 1070.). So it seems certain that the person who was never canonically enrolled as a member of the Church can have no right to those benefits which are proper to Catholics as such. Among these benefits we may class the funeral services which were instituted by the Church to be performed over the bodies of the "Faithful departed".

Not only has this non-Catholic husband no right to ecclesiastical burial, but it seems clear to us that it would be forbidden to give it to

¹Potest tamen ipsum jus ad sepulturam ipso actu baptismatis suspendi, si, nempe, baptismus ab heretico heretice recipiatur. (Coronata. *De Locis et Temporibus Sacris*. n. 254.)

him, for the reason that he is legally a notorious member of an heretical sect. He was enrolled as such when his parents presented him to a Protestant minister to be christened, just as Catholic children are enrolled as members of the Church when they are brought to the priest to be baptised. He had the space of a lifetime to repudiate this act and to change his religious affiliation, and yet he did not do so. A Catholic who does not practise his Religion does not thereby become a Protestant, nor, conversely, does a Protestant become a Catholic by abstaining from attendance at all religious worship. We think the man remained in *statu quo* of his baptism as a member of an heretical sect. We take it that every one knows that he is not a Catholic, and that if he is considered as a Christian at all it is as a member of some Protestant denomination. He is, it seems, notoriously a member of an heretical sect; and unless it can be shown that he gave signs before his death of a desire to be reconciled to the true Church, he cannot be given ecclesiastical burial, even privately.

Canon E. J. O'Mahoney, in vol. 2 of "Questions and Answers" (n. 619), treats of this very case, and writes: "It is our view that ecclesiastical burial, exclusive of the *Requiem* Mass, is not forbidden in the above circumstances by canon 1240, subject to the decision of the Ordinary, if he can be reached". He argues that deprivation of ecclesiastical burial is a penalty—*poena*—and so the law is to be interpreted liberally. We agree to a liberal interpretation of the law, but from what we have said are satisfied that the man is definitely excluded by can. 1240, n. 1. Further the author just quoted would exclude the *Requiem* Mass as forbidden by can. 2262, par. 2, n. 2. This canon deals with the effects of excommunication as they deprive the delinquent of the public prayers and suffrages of the Church. The recital of the burial service is a public prayer of the Church, even if done in the presence of merely a few. If the *Requiem* Mass is forbidden, so also is any other funeral service. Ecclesiastical burial according to the Code (can. 1240) consists of three public and religious acts: the bringing of the corpse to the Church, the performance of the exequial rites there—among these is the *Requiem* Mass—and its interment in a place lawfully set aside for the burial of the faithful departed. We fail to see how one function could be allowed when the others are forbidden. Sometimes circumstances may dictate that some one or perhaps two of these public acts of the ecclesiastical ritual be omitted, but the deceased person would have a *right* to them all or to none.

Bouscaren-Ellis² also are inclined to the milder opinion. It is maintained that there is no question of a notorious crime and so the person would not be excluded by can. 1240, par. 1, n. 1, thought it is admitted that he has no right to ecclesiastical burial because there exists an "obstacle to the bond of ecclesiastical communion" (can. 87). The conclusion drawn by these authors is: "For such a case, admittedly exceptional, it seems that the Bishop could grant Christian burial to a baptised non-Catholic 'who is publicly known, or can be publicly known by announcement of his wish, to have desired, in so far as he was able under the circumstances, to be united to the Church of Christ'. The decision would pertain to the Bishop in view of the circumstances of each case". In this exceptional case, be it noted, some positive evidence is available of the man's desire—even if it be merely implicit—to belong to the true Church.

The reader can judge for himself whether it would not cause admiration among the faithful in these parts if ecclesiastical burial were to be given to a person, whatever may be his subjective dispositions, who never took steps of any sort to be received into the Church.

There is another consideration—not a canonical one—which must not be lost sight of. The deceased man's own wishes must be respected. Even though it be admitted as probable that he is not definitely excluded from ecclesiastical burial, the fact of his whole life separated from the Church should be sufficient reason to indicate that he did not desire her public prayers and ritual after his death.

To sum up: Our opinion is that the non-Catholic husband who died as he lived, separated from the unity of the Church, but without definite association with an heretical sect, should not be given any form of ecclesiastical burial. There is authority for the view that he is not excluded by can. 1240, n. 1. The only practical advice we can give is that, if the case should arise and the relatives request the presence of the priest at the funeral, he submit the matter to the Bishop and abide by his decision.

JAMES MADDEN.

²Canon Law, p. 618 seq.

Liturgy

NOTES CONCERNING THE CHURCH AND ITS FURNISHINGS. III.

ORNAMENTATION OF THE ALTAR.

1.—*Reliquaries.*

The rubrics of the Missal (*Rit. Servand.* IV, 5.) direct the method to be followed at the incensation of the altar if there be relics or images of the Saints placed thereon. The *Caerimoniale Episcoporum* (*Lib.* I, xii, 12) also mentions the use of relics as an ornamentation of the altar on the greatest feasts. There is no obligation from either of these liturgical books to have relics on the altar at any time, though their use is certainly laudable. The number of reliquaries permitted is nowhere determined; but from the wording of the *Caerimoniale* (*loc. cit.*), *disponi poterunt alternatim inter ipsa candelabra*, it would seem that four would be the most that would be desired. The correct place for the reliquaries is between the candle-sticks, and thus on the *mensa* of the altar or on the gradine. It is not permitted to place them either on top of the tabernacle or in front of it. (*S.C.R.* 2613, 6; 2740, 1; 2906). When the relics are exposed outside Mass or the Divine Office, at least two lights must burn before them. They must not be placed on the altar during the time of Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament or for the seasonal Offices of Advent or Lent or an Office for the Dead. A pall is not placed under the reliquary unless it contains a relic of the true Cross. The relics of canonised Saints may be exposed for veneration throughout the entire world; relics of the *Beati* only in those places where their Office and Mass are celebrated by the permission of the Holy See (*can.* 1287, *par.* 3). The reliquaries must be duly sealed and the relics authenticated by an authorised ecclesiastical person before they are exposed for public veneration (*can.* 1283, *para.* 1).

The rubrics make mention, in addition, of statues on the altar. These should be made of precious metal or stone and of proportionate size. They must follow the prescriptions of Canon Law as regards the use of representations which are in accord with Catholic dogma and tradition (*cf.* *can.* 1279).

Flowers.

Though the use of flowers on the altar is not usual in Rome, it is not liturgically incorrect to decorate the altar with them, except during

the penitential seasons when the Office or Mass is in violet vestments. Even then, flowers are permitted on certain occasions: *Gaudete* Sunday in Advent, *Laetare* Sunday in Lent, on Holy Thursday and on Holy Saturday (for Mass), on Christmas Eve and the feast of the Holy Innocents. They should not, of course, be used during the Office or Mass for the dead, but there seems no necessity to remove them for a private celebration of the *Missa quotidiana*. The *Caerimoniale Episcoporum* (loc. cit.) mentions flowers as being adornments for the Altar on the greater feasts. Fresh natural flowers or sweet-smelling plants or artificial flowers of silk may be used, but not those which are made of paper. (cf. Plen. Counc. IV, dec. 510). The correct place for the flowers is between the candlesticks, never on top of the tabernacle or in front of it. At all times they should be used with restraint; an over abundance of flowers, rather than serving to adorn the altar, smothers and spoils it.

Candles.

Candles have always been considered as necessary for the celebration of Mass and the other sacred functions. Bees-wax is recognised as the most precious material for the composition of candles, and so the Church with good reason prescribes wax candles as those which are to be used at the liturgical services. Let us first ennumerate the number of candles required for the various functions, and then endeavour to satisfy ourselves about the percentage of bees-wax they should contain.

For Low Mass two candles are prescribed, nor is it permitted to have more than two *ratione celebrantis*, unless he be a Bishop. For a Bishop's Mass it is fitting that there should be four candles on solemn feasts, but on other less solemn occasions and on ferial days, two candles suffice (*Caer. Epis.* I, 4). *Ratione solemnitatis*, and on other occasions when the Mass is not strictly private, v.g., a parochial or conventual Mass, Mass celebrated on the occasion of First Communion, the conferring of Holy Orders, etc., or the Mass that takes the place of a High Mass, on Ash Wednesday, Palm Sunday, the last three days of Holy Week, etc., six candles may be lighted, even though the celebrant be a simple priest.

A *Missa cantata* is usually celebrated with four candles, though on the greater feasts six are allowed. Six candles are lighted for a solemn Mass with ministers, but for a solemn Requiem four are sufficient.

For Pontifical High Mass celebrated by the local Ordinary, a

seventh candle is added, being placed behind the crucifix in the same line as other candle-sticks. The seventh candle is also lighted at an Episcopal Consecration or at the conferring of Orders, when the Ordinary is the consecrating or ordaining prelate, even though the Mass be not *in cantu*.

For continued Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament twenty candles are required (Plen. Council, dec. 546). Twelve will suffice for what we usually call Benediction with the Monstrance, and six for Benediction with the Ciborium.

On the occasion of Weddings, Funerals, etc., two candles are sufficient, but six are permitted.

The Paschal Candle remains in the sanctuary, on the Gospel side, from Holy Saturday till Ascension Thursday: it is required again for the blessing of the font on the Vigil of Pentecost. The Paschal Candle is lighted for solemn Mass and Vespers on Easter Sunday, all Sundays *post Pascha*, and on Monday, Tuesday, and Saturday of Easter Week. If there be no Solemn Mass on these days, it is lighted at the Low Mass which is celebrated instead. The Paschal Candle is never used for a Requiem Mass, for a Mass celebrated in violet vestments, or for Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, except this follows immediately after Vespers.

Candles may be purchased on the market made of wax, and candles are procurable at a much cheaper price which are made from tallow, paraffin, etc. The Plenary Council (dec. 547) laid down that the candle for private or solemn Mass must be of wax at least for the most part (*saltem in maxima parte*), while the other candles used on the altar must contain bees-wax to a considerable amount (*in notabile parte*). What percentage of wax would be the equivalent of the *maxima* or the *notabilis pars* required is difficult to determine. At any rate, it seems that candles are actually manufactured containing 65% and 25% wax respectively. The former would appear to conform to requirements for Mass and the latter for the other sacred functions. When six candles are permitted for Mass, is it according to the law to have two of them containing 65% wax and the other four only 25%? We think that all six candles should be of wax in *maxima parte* (65%), and this is the obvious meaning of the decree of the Plenary Council which we quoted above.

During the recent war, on account of the impossibility of procuring

wax candles, the S.C.R. (13th March, 1942) granted the faculty to the Ordinaries to allow the sacred functions to be held with fewer candles than prescribed, but the number of lights could be made up by other means, even by the use of electric lamps. This faculty is now modified, and by a decree of the S.C.R. (18th August, 1949, A.A.S., p. 477). Two wax candles are henceforth needed for the celebration of private Mass, at least four for a solemn or sung Mass, and likewise four for solemn exposition of the Blessed Sacrament. The number of lights required may be supplied by other means. The prescriptions of the Liturgical Law have not been restored in their full vigour on account of the expense involved in the purchase of wax candles.

We may note that the Australasian Bishops have from the S.C. of Propaganda a faculty which is independent of the general indult which was given in 1942 to all the Bishops and since modified by the decree of last August. It reads:

Permittendi ut Missa celebrari possit cum uno lumine cuiusvis generis, dummodo cera apum desit; nec non permittendi ut Missa absque luminibus celebrari possit, in casu tamen verae necessitatis, et graviter onerata conscientia ipsius Ordinarii.

In normal times there would be, in our conditions, little need for such a indult; but during the war it was and even still is difficult and sometimes impossible to procure wax candles. In many places the Bishops availed of their faculty and permitted the celebration of Mass with ordinary household candles. We do not know that there was ever necessity to say Mass *absque luminibus*. Whether particular or general dispensations from the obligation of having wax candles for Mass and other liturgical functions, which were granted during the War period are still in force or have been withdrawn, our readers will know from the directions of their own Ordinaries.

In our next issue, we will deal with the Sanctuary Lamp and the use of electric light in the decoration of the altar and the sanctuary.

R. F. DONOHOE.

*

*

*

*

MASS WITHOUT A SERVER.

The S. Congregation of Sacraments recently (1st Oct., 1949) issued to the Local Ordinaries an Instruction concerning conditions to be observed when requesting Indults for the celebration of Mass or the Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament in circumstances other than those contemplated by Law. In four Parts, the Instruction deals in order

with 1) The privilege of a private Oratory, 2) The privilege of a portable Altar, 3) The faculty of celebrating Mass without a server, and 4) the indult to reserve the Blessed Sacrament in private chapels. The first and last sections of this Instruction do not call for any comment here, as private Oratories are practically unknown in Australia. The second part, which concerns the privilege of a portable Altar is to a great extent taken up with the conditions to be observed when this privilege is sought for a sick or infirm priest, but it also gives directions for the use of the permission to say Mass outside a Church for the necessity or benefit of the faithful. In not a few country districts, the only opportunity the people have of hearing Mass at all is when the priest comes to them; and as there is no Church in the neighbourhood, he celebrates the Holy Sacrifice in the home of one of the faithful. Our Ordinaries have the Faculty to permit Mass to be celebrated, in case of necessity, on a portable Altar, provided proper care is taken, there is no danger of irreverence and the place chosen is fitting. The Instruction stresses that in every case the place where Mass is said must be suitable for the purpose and befitting the Holy Sacrifice. It must be suitable, that is safe and secure and large enough to ensure that there will be no danger of profanation and spilling of the Chalice. A bed-room is not a place which befits the dignity of the Mass, and it is forbidden to celebrate in a place used for sleeping quarters. Further, the substitute for the structure of the Altar, on which the Stone is placed, must be clean and not used for profane purposes; it must likewise be sufficiently large to hold the Stone and the Missal and permit the decent observance of the rubrics by the priest while he says Mass.

The third part of the Instruction treats at length with the Faculty to celebrate Mass without a server. It recalls the Law as stated in can. 813 of the Code, by which a priest is forbidden to celebrate without a minister who serves and makes the responses. The reasons for this precept are briefly touched on: i) the server is the representative of the whole Christian people, ii) the ancient custom according to which the priest was assisted by deacons and ministers and the whole assembly of people responded, iii) some portions and prayers of the Mass are in the plural number and presuppose the presence of some assistant to the priest, and iv) the need for some one to help the celebrant at the ceremonies and also to take steps to summon help in case he is overcome by bodily sickness or infirmity. The custom of saying Mass without a minister, and even with nobody present, seems to have arisen in the monasteries.

There are cases when, according to the unanimous teaching of theologians, Mass may be celebrated without a server: i) To administer Viaticum to a sick person and there is no server available, ii) so that the people may satisfy the precept of hearing Mass on a Sunday or other day of obligation, iii) during a time of pestilence when no server can be found and otherwise the priest would have to remain for a considerable time without saying Mass, and iv) if the server departs and does not return after the Mass has commenced.

It is better to have a poorly instructed server than none at all, provided he can perform the principal duties of the server: hand the cruets, shift the missal and ring the bell.

Outside the cases of necessity just enumerated a server is necessary, a cleric in preference to a lay person; but the server must never be a woman, for it is forbidden *sub gravi* for a woman to serve *at the altar*. In the course of time, because of the absence of clerics, lay persons, especially boys, were permitted to serve Mass. The boys to whom this noble privilege is given should be well trained in their duties.

When no male is available, whether cleric or lay, it is permitted, i.e., in case of necessity, that a woman make the responses from afar, but she must not approach the Altar. Accordingly due preparations must be made beforehand for the convenience of the priest. A just cause is required to permit a woman to answer in place of a male.

Indults hitherto granted by the S. Congregation of Sacraments for the celebration of Mass without a server always contained a clause that in accord with can. 813 not only boys should be taught the serving of Mass but the faithful in general, and even women should learn how to answer the priest by reading the responses from a distance. The Holy Father has lately added another clause to the indult of celebrating without a server: provided some one of the faithful assists at the Holy Sacrifice (*dummodo aliquis fidelis Sacro assistat*); and this clause must always be observed.

We would in particular draw the attention of our readers to this last clause. It is introduced by the word *dummodo*, which means that the validity of the indult depends on the observance of the condition. Henceforth, then, it would seem that there must always be some one present when Mass is said, even when a priest makes use of the indult or faculty he may have of saying Mass without a server. The *Missa solitaria* is forbidden, or at least permission for it is not granted in the indult *celebrandi sine ministro*.

This Instruction, we may note, was ordered by His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, to be published in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* and to be observed faithfully by all priests and faithful of the Latin rite.

*

*

*

*

QUERIES.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Recently a young lady brought me her Engagement Ring to be blessed. A quick look through the Ritual did not reveal either the Engagement Ceremony or the Blessing of the Ring. I think the blessing of the ring could well be encouraged when so many look on courtship and engagement so lightly. Would the Blessing of the Wedding Ring do for the Engagement Ring?

OCCIDENTALIS.

REPLY.

The formalities prescribed for Betrothal are legal rather than sacred. Betrothal or Engagement, as it is sometimes called, is "a mutual deliberate and free promise, made in legal form, that is in writing, by two definite persons legally capable of marriage, to marry one another validly and lawfully at some future time". For a validity it must be in writing and signed by the parties and also by: a) the Parish Priest of the place, *or* b) the local Ordinary, *or* c) two witnesses. Nothing further is required, and so the giving and receiving of a ring, while it may be a fitting manner of sealing the contract, is not demanded by Law. On the other hand, if the formalities prescribed are not observed, the betrothal has no force either in law or conscience. It follows that the so-called betrothals or engagements which are customary in this country are not valid promises, but mutual declarations of a sincere intention to marry in the future. It is usual for the young lady to receive from her future husband a ring, which she wears, among other reasons, as a sign that she will not entertain an offer of marriage from any other man.

It was a pious thought that brought the young person to OCCIDENTALIS to have her Engagement Ring blessed, and it shows that she realises she is preparing for something sacred in the Sacrament of Matrimony. We certainly think the idea worthy of encouragement. There is, however, no formula in the Ritual for the blessing of such a ring. The words of the Blessing for the Wedding Ring are hardly applicable, as they refer to fidelity in the married state and the mutual charity to be exercised in community of life (*..fidelitatem integram*

suo sponso tenens...in mutua caritate semper vivat). The best suggestion we have to offer is to recite the *Benedictio ad omnia*.

* * * *

QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE OFFICE.

Dear Rev. Sir,

1. My Faculty-Paper, in giving me permission to recite Matins and Lauds of the following day after noon, does not add (as a former Paper did) *expleto Divino Officio Diei*. Is it in order then to anticipate before the completion of the day's Office; or, at least, is it a valid anticipation?

2. I recite the Office from Lauds to Compline without a break, and omit (as I seem directed to do) the Antiphon of the B.V.M. after Lauds, will the Antiphon at the end on Compline suffice for both?

SENEX.

REPLY.

The Faculty of anticipating Matins and Lauds immediately after mid-day is granted by the Ordinaries of Australia in virtue of the powers delegated to them by the S. Congregation of Propaganda, 1 Jan., 1941, for a period of ten years. The Bishops' pagella reads: "44. Concedendi ut privatim recitari possit *matutinum cum laudibus* diei sequentis statim *post meridiem*". There is here no mention of the need to have already completed the Office of the current day. The older Faculty Sheets did have this restriction, which was contained in the *Formula Secunda Major* which the Australian Ordinaries enjoyed previous to 1941. It ran: "31. Concedendi ut, expleto Divino Officio diei, legitima concurrente causa, privatim recitari possit *matutinum cum laudibus* diei sequentis, statim *post meridiem*". This will explain the difference in the two faculties which SENEX has enjoyed at different periods of his priestly life.

Is it in order to anticipate before the completion of the day's Office? Normally, the Office should be said *ordinatim* and it is somewhat irregular to be already in to-morrow in our liturgical prayers when we have not yet concluded to-day. However, the inversion is of slight moment, and any reasonable cause will justify it. In any case, the recitation of to-morrow's Matins and Lauds is valid after mid-day to-day, without regard to the progress that has been made in the Office of the current day.

2. The Antiphon of the B.V.M. is recited in the public recitation of the Office every time there is a departure from Choir. In private recitation, it is prescribed after Lauds and Compline, with the reservation that

if the cleric proceeds immediately after Lauds with other hours of the Office, he says the Antiphon when he breaks off. This could be after any one of the Hours. If he continues to the end of Compline, before putting down the Breviary, the Antiphon is said then only. If there is a break between Lauds and Compline, the Antiphon is said twice during the day; if there is no such break, it is said only once.

* * * *

HOLY COMMUNION ADMINISTERED AS VIATICUM. NUPTIAL BLESSING FOR CONVERTS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

A priest anoints a sick person too ill to receive the Blessed Sacrament. A few days later another Priest visits the patient and finds him still in danger of death but able to receive. This second priest brings him Holy Communion, but in administering It uses the usual form *Corpus Domini, etc.* Can this Communion be considered as constituting Viaticum, or is there still an obligation of administering It with the proper form?

2. If a non-baptised bride becomes a Catholic some years after her marriage, with a Dispensation, to a Catholic, is it advisable or permitted to impart the Nuptial Blessing? Can she in any way receive the Sacrament of Matrimony?

DUBIUS.

REPLY.

1. The divine precept, promulgated also by the authority of the Church in can. 884, par. 1, of the Code, is to receive Holy Communion in danger of death. This precept is fulfilled no matter under what formula the Sacred Species are given to the recipient. The use of the words *Accipe, frater, etc.*, is prescribed by liturgical law (Rit. Rom. Tit. IV, cap. IV, n. 19) and should have been used by the Priest who gave Communion to the dying man. Whether he usurped the rights of the Parish Priest in giving Viaticum is another matter; but there is no need to administer It again. The dying man, if able to receive, may have, and it is fitting that he should have, Holy Communion, *per modum Viatici* frequently, even every day, at the discretion of his Confessor.

2. When the woman, who was validly married to a Catholic, receives the Sacrament of Baptism, the marriage *ipso facto* becomes a *matrimonium inter Christianos* and a Sacrament. Together with the graces of Baptism she receives those of Matrimony. She may receive the Nuptial Blessing (together with her husband), for this may be given

even after the married couple have lived for a long time in the state of matrimony (can. 1101). It is to be noted that the Nuptial Blessing of the Missal can be given only during Mass. Whether it would be advisable to arrange for her to receive it, the Parish Priest could decide in view of all the circumstances. It is the wish of the Church that she should, for the Code lays down (can. cit.) *Parochus curet ut sponsi benedictionem sollemnem accipiant*. The importance of the Nuptial Blessing should not be exaggerated to the extent that the convert woman would think there was something essentially wanting to her marriage until she had received it.

* * * *

SANCTUARY BELL.

Dear Rev. Sir,

1. I read once, though I cannot recollect where, that at the Elevation at Mass the third ring of the bell should be when the Priest replaces the Host or Chalice on the corporal, and when he genuflects. Is there any authority for this practice which does not seem usual?

2. In some Churches the bell is tingled during Benediction all the time the priest is giving Benediction with the Monstrance. Is this against the rubrics? If so, when should the first of the usual three rings be made?

PAROCHUS.

REPLY.

1. The *Ritus servandus* (VIII., 6) prescribes that the server ring the bell three times at each Elevation or continuously until the priest replaces the Host on the corporal, and similarly at the Elevation of the Chalice. There are thus two methods of sounding the small bell, each in accord with the rubrics: a) to ring it three times at each Elevation, and b) to ring it continuously while the sacred Elements are elevated. Whether the three rings in the first case should be given at the actual Elevation or once at each genuflexion and once at the Elevation is not certain. It is safe to conform to custom which seems to be for the server to ring the bell not merely at the Elevation but also at each genuflexion. This is the method described by Rev. J. O'Connell (*The Celebration of Mass*, Vol. 2, p. 205, 6).

2. The use of the Bell is not prescribed for the Blessing with the Monstrance at the conclusion of Exposition. It seems to be a matter of custom, arising, perhaps, from the practice of ringing the bell at the Elevation of the Mass to draw the attention of the people and invite them to the adoration. It would be correct to ring it continuously dur-

ing the Blessing or three times, but we are unable to determine the precise instants at which it should be sounded—perhaps for the three positions which correspond to the invocation of the three Divine Persons when a blessing with the sign of the Cross is given at other times.

* * * *

THE MASS *PRO POPULO*.

Dear Rev. Sir,

What are the days on which a parish priest is bound to offer the Mass *pro populo*?

PAROCHUS.

REPLY.

In those districts which are bound by the decrees of the fourth Plenary Council of Australia and New Zealand, irremovable parish priests are bound to offer the Mass *pro populo* on all Sundays and suppressed Feasts; while removable pastors satisfy this obligation by applying the Mass for their people on the eleven principal Feasts of the year. (dec. n. 206).

The Council of Trent (Sess. XXIII, cap. 1) in the preamble to the Decree on Residence enumerates the various duties which are incumbent from divine precept on all to whom is entrusted the care of souls. Among these duties is that of offering sacrifice for their flocks (*pro eis sacrificium offerre*). This obligation, from the will of Christ, is absolute as regards the diocesan Bishops who rule their Dioceses by divine right; it is conditional, in the case of parish priests and others who have the care of souls by reason of an office which is of ecclesiastical institution—the condition being the commission by the Church of the care of souls to others than the successors of the Apostles. There is also an obligation from justice to offer the Holy Sacrifice for those whose spiritual care is undertaken by virtue of a quasi-contract. The parish priest engages to provide his people with all that is necessary for the discharge of their obligations towards God, and with the means of grace to enable them to save their souls. The Christian people are bound to adore God by sacrifice and their pastor is appointed by the Church to discharge this duty for them; they stand in need of the gifts and blessings which are the fruits of the Sacrifice which Christ left his Church. So the priest, whose office gives him the care of souls, is bound to say Mass that the people may assist at it and so give God the supreme honour which is His due, and the Pastor is likewise bound to *apply* the Mass for his flock, at least occasionally, as a means of obtaining the graces necessary and expedient for their salvation.

The Church determines the divine and the natural law, and in her legislation prescribes the days on which pastors are to apply the Mass *pro populo*. Bishops and Parish Priests must offer the holy Sacrifice for their people on all Sundays and the Feasts of precept, even those on which the faithful are no longer bound to assist at Mass and abstain from servile works. A list of these Feasts was published by Pope Urban VIII in the Constitution *Universa* (13th September, 1642). It remains unchanged, except that the Feast of the Immaculate Conception was added by Pope Clement IX in 1708. The promulgation of the Code did not introduce any departure from the discipline hitherto in force, as we know from a reply of the Pontifical Commission for its Interpretation given on 17th February, 1918 (*A.A.S.* XVIII, 245). In order to remove all doubt, the S. Congregation of the Council published a list of the suppressed Feasts on which, according to cann. 339 and 486, the obligation of applying the Mass *pro populo* is in force in the Universal Church. These feasts are: Monday and Tuesday after Easter and after Pentecost—The Finding of the Holy Cross (3rd May)—The Purification of the Blessed Virgin Mary (2nd February)—The Annuntiation of the Blessed Virgin Mary (25th March)—The Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary (8th September)—The Dedication of St. Michael, the Archangel (29th September)—The Nativity of St. John the Baptist (24th June)—The Feasts of the following Apostles: St. Andrew (30th November), St. James (25th July), St. John (27th December), St. Thomas (21st December), SS. Philip and James (1st May), St. Bartholomew (24th August), St. Matthew (21st September), SS. Simon and Jude (28th October), and St. Matthias (24th February)—The Feasts of St. Stephen the first Martyr (26th December), St. Lawrence (10th August), St. Silvester (31st December), St. Anne (26th July), the Patron of the Kingdom or Nation, and the Patron of the place.¹ The feasts of S. Mark Ev. and S. Luke Ev. are not included.²

¹With regard to the Patron, it is to be noted that the Patron must be properly chosen, and approved by the Holy See. Further, if there be several Patrons, the Mass *pro populo* is to be said on only one of them. (*...atque unius ex principalioribus Patronis in quocumque Regno vel Provincia*—Const. "Universa" of Urban VIII.) If there be a Patron of a Diocese or City, the obligation of the Mass *pro populo* binds also on the Feast. In Australia, some of the Dioceses have duly elected Patrons, but we are not aware of any Cities being under the Patronage of particular Saints. The Principal Patron of Australia would be Our Lady Help of Christians. St. Francis Xavier and St. Teresa of the Infant Jesus are venerated as Patrons because we are subject to the S. Congregation of Propaganda, and these two Saints are Patrons of all the Missions.

²The Feast of St. Luke (18th Oct.) is incorrectly marked P.P. in the Ordo for this year.

To these days must be added the Feasts of Precept for the Universal Church: All the Sundays of the year, the Feasts of our Lord's Nativity (25th December), Circumcision (1st January), Epiphany (6th January), and Ascension and of Corpus Christi; the Immaculate Conception (8th December) and Assumption (15th August) of the Blessed Virgin Mary; St. Joseph (19th March), SS. Peter and Paul (29th June), and of all the Saints (1st November).

In Missionary countries where the Hierarchy is not as yet constituted, there are no parishes strictly called, but the territorial divisions of a Vicariate or Prefecture Apostolic are called quasi-parishes and are administered by *quasi-parochi*. These also have an obligation of applying Mass for their people, but only on eleven days of the year: Christmas, the Epiphany, Easter Sunday, the Ascension of our Lord, Pentecost Sunday, Corpus Christi, the Immaculate Conception, and the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Feasts of St. Joseph, SS. Peter and Paul and of all the Saints.

After the promulgation of the Code, the status of the territorial divisions of those Dioceses subject to Propaganda was a matter of doubt; but by a Decree of this S. Congregation (9th December, 1920) it was stated that they are Parishes, though the parish Priests are bound by the obligations which in law affect *quasi-parochi*. Consequently, the parish priests were obliged to the *Missa pro populo* only on the eleven days mentioned above. The Plenary Council imposed on irremovable parish priests the same obligations as in countries under Common Law, and left the responsibilities of the removable pastors as they were before the Council.

To go into further detail on this matter would pertain rather to the Section on Moral Theology or Canon Law. However, two interesting points may be mentioned. If one of the Feasts on which the *Missa pro populo* is to be offered falls on a Sunday, the irremovable parish priest satisfies both obligations by the application of only one Mass. Secondly, if the Feast is transferred with regard to the Mass and Office only, and there is no obligation on the faithful to hear Mass and abstain from servile works on the day when the Office and Mass of the Feasts are eventually said, the application of the Mass *pro populo* is to be made on the day from which the Feast was transferred, i.e., on the *dies a qua* and not on the *dies ad quam*. As none of the five Holidays of Obligation in force in these countries can possibly be transferred, the Mass *pro populo* is

always applied on the date on which it should fall, v.g., the Mass for the Feast of St. Joseph is fixed to 19th March, even though the liturgical celebration may not take place for a fortnight on account of the incidence of Holy Week and Easter with its Octave.

JAMES MADDEN.

Homiletics

THE BLESSED EUCHARIST: MYSTERY OF FAITH.

"The bread that I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world".

(John, c. 6, v. 52).

Of the Eucharist alone does the Church in her sacred liturgy exclaim: O Mystery of Faith! So overcome is she with reverential wonder in the presence of this ineffable gift drawn from the Heart of her Spouse that immediately the Priest has pronounced those divine words: "This is the chalice of my blood, of the new and eternal testament", she can contain herself no longer, but, hastily interrupting, she places on his lips those words which burst from her overwhelmed heart: "O Mystery of Faith". It is only when she has thus given voice to her irrepressible sentiments of awe, gratitude and love, and lies in quivering adoration at the feet of her Spouse, that she allows the Priest to continue the words of Christ when instituting this sacrament: . . . "which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins".

Ever zealous of preserving the exact Words of our Saviour, ever treating them as a most sacred deposit, the Church, when pronouncing these, of all words the most sacred, yet dares to take this liberty. In doing so she gives voice to the deep persuasion that has gripped her doctors, theologians and children throughout all christian centuries: the Blessed Eucharist is the Mystery of Faith par excellence.

It is so, firstly, because it marvellously contains in itself a compendium of all Catholic dogmas. He who thinks rightly concerning the Eucharist thinks rightly concerning the whole body of God's revelation; and he who errs concerning this Sacrament will never halt on the path of error. All mysteries either gravitate towards this crowning work of the Word Incarnate, or flow from it like limpid streams gushing from a pure fountain. When we contemplate It with the luminous eye of faith we are carried by It in ravishing thought beyond this world of time and space. Does It not elevate us to the very bosom of the Adorable Trinity where, amidst the splendours of light inaccessible, the Father eternally brings forth His only-begotten Son, communicating to Him the fulness of perfection and infinite beauty of the Godhead? For, wherein lies the greatness of this Sacrament, if not in the fact that It contains that eternal Son of God, generated from the Father's substance? Does It not open wide the merciful heart of

God our Father, whose name is Love, when, contemplating the sad spectacle of man's utter ruin through the base treachery of original sin, He decided to send this only-begotten Son who alone could re-unite man with his God in the embrace of friendship and love? Is not this august Sacrament the extension and continuation of the mystery of the Incarnation, containing in itself and preserving in our midst Him who united His Godhead to our lowly nature in the pure womb of His Virgin-Mother? Is not He the divine good Samaritan Who, seeing us stripped of our heavenly raiment and left for death in a vale of tears, being moved to mercy, came down to us to bind our wounds and pour in the soothing oil of His infinite merits? Is not our Eucharistic Christ that same Christ whose bleeding Body was immolated for us on the terrible altar of the Cross, whereon by one perfect sacrifice He accomplished the work of our redemption and stored up for us an inexhaustible treasury of graces for our sanctification? Did not the whole of that great drama move towards this masterpiece of all Christ's works among men—the Blessed Eucharist—which He chose as the incomparable means of communicating to us all the virtues of His life and death? It is the stretching-out of the Blessed Trinity and the embracing-arms of the Cross of Christ through the ages.

The Eucharist is the mysterious abyss wherein lies the source of all graces. No grace comes except through Christ, and Christ to-day is the Eucharistic Christ! It is the source of all graces, the fountain of all life, precisely because It contains, in the fulness of His Person, Jesus Christ, the fountain-head and author of all grace and sanctity. It is the means whereby the God-man prolongs and multiplies and conveys to men, in this valley of exile, the ever-continued renewal of the sacrifice of Calvary. By receiving this glorious Sacrament men are brought into a union with God, than which there is none more intimate or more holy in this life. And why all this?—That the stream of divine life, centred in Christ the God-Man, and by Him subjected in the Eucharist, might flow back once more to the bosom of the Trinity, but now carrying in its vivifying stream the countless souls of the lovers of God. All things were recapitulated in Christ, the God-man; and the whole of God's plan and all His mysteries thus recapitulated are concentrated in the august sacrament of the Eucharist. There all things are reduced to unity; there all the mysteries and marvels of a loving and merciful God are wondrously summed up: "He hath made a remembrance of all his wonderful works, being a

merciful and gracious Lord. He hath given food to them that fear him". (Ps. 110).

O Mystery of Faith!

Secondly, the Eucharist is *in itself* an astounding Mystery of Faith. In the immense assemblage of wonders with which God has filled time and space there is none more wonderful or more sublime than the Eucharist. This one mystery contains such an abundance and variety of miracles that nature is forced to halt her laws in amazed surprise and draw back reverently before the omnipotent hand of her God. Here we believe that the whole substance of bread and wine is instantly changed into the whole substance of the Body and Blood of Christ. We believe that Jesus Christ, true God and true man, is present on our altars in the fulness of His divinity and glorious humanity. We believe that the one and same Christ, without any change or corruption in His own sacred Person, is really and truly present in a hundred thousand places at one and the same moment. We believe that every part of our Saviour's humanity in the perfectly ordered construction of a human organism is present in the smallest particle of the consecrated Host. We believe that if the Host is divided into many parts, each part contains the Body and Blood, Soul and Divinity of Jesus Christ the Word of God Incarnate. We believe that the accidents of bread and wine, which normally demand inherence in their natural substance, are here sustained by Divine power without any subject of inherence. We believe all this in spite of the evidence of all our senses; and he who believes it not is none of Christ's. O truly sublime Mystery of Faith! The eye of man has not seen, the heart of man has not conceived, the ear of faith alone testifies what God has prepared for those who love Him. Here I believe only what I hear. I believe in the true and infallible words of Jesus Christ, the Truth Incarnate, and guided by that voice, with closed eyes and fettered hands, I plunge into the truth of God's Eucharistic Mystery.

In order to increase our faith in this prodigy of God's omnipotence and love, let us go back and stand with the crowd pressing round Jesus in the Synagogue of Capharnaum. For three days and nights this vast concourse had followed Our Lord in the wilderness, in their hearts a craving for the words of life that fell from his lips. They had witnessed the great miracle of the multiplication of the loaves, had "eaten of the loaves and were filled". In a burst of enthusiasm they had declared Him to be "truly the prophet that is to come into the world". They

would even have made Him King of Israel. The Apostles, moreover, had been amazed to see Him walking towards their boat upon the turbulent waves of the wind-swept sea. In short, the hearts of all had been confirmed in their belief of His irresistible power in working astounding miracles. Our Saviour, in accordance with His custom of propounding doctrines drawn from the miracles He wrought (John, 4, 10; Mt. 5, 43; etc.), seized this most appropriate and favourable opportunity to announce the great promise of the institution of the Blessed Eucharist. (John, c. 6). "Amen, amen I say to you, . . . Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that which endureth unto like everlasting, which the Son of man will give you".

Having stressed again and again, with increasing emphasis, the absolute necessity of believing in His words and doctrines; having presented Faith as the only door through which one may enter to a contemplation of God's mysteries (vv. 26-47); having thus by persuading words and miraculous works prepared their minds and disposed their wills for the reception of the great truth He was about to communicate to them, Jesus said: "I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world". (51-52). That Body which, not long hence, you shall see, mangled and bleeding on the wood of the Cross, my Body offered in bloody sacrifice for the salvation of the world,—that is the flesh that I will give you to eat! A current of shocked surprise and bewilderment passes from man to man in the crowded assembly. What! "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" The incredulous Jews give vent to their scorn and derision. Jesus, perceiving that His audience has taken his words literally, understanding Him to speak of the real eating of His real flesh, proceeds to confirm them in their interpretation: "Amen, amen I say to you: except you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you". Loud protests break forth from the astounded audience. The reverence, awe, and admiration of but an hour ago have given place to hostility, incredulity, and utter perplexity. But Christ persists in His startling statements. With ever-rising emphasis and terrible threats of eternal damnation on all who refuse to accept His doctrine, He repeats with unwonted vehemence that the food that He will give is truly His real flesh to be eaten, His real blood to be drunk: "My flesh is meat indeed: and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me: and I in him". The

Scribes and Pharisees withdraw, their proud countenances lined with sneers and laughter. But Christ, our Lord, retracts not one syllable of the words He has spoken. For the sixth time in so many sentences their ears ring with the astounding doctrine that men will eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ-Jesus of Nazareth: "He that eateth Me, the same shall live by Me. This is the bread that came down from heaven. . . . He that eateth this bread shall live for ever".

Who shall describe the consternation that filled the hearts of His numerous disciples? Disappointment settled in their souls like growing nausea. The brilliant hopes of that morning turned to ashes in their hearts. Turning to one another, they said: "This saying is hard; and who can hear it?" Drawing their cloaks about them they withdrew with down-cast eyes, ashamed of their utter disillusionment.

Jesus watches their departure with heavy heart. There goes one to whom He had opened the marvels of creation with a light touch to the eyes. There another departs with firm tread, who but a week ago lay stricken with paralysis. Here is the man born deaf and dumb, now protesting the impossibility of the great promise. Here the man from whom He had cast out the devil, there the man who once lay in despair at the pool of Bethsaida. Singly and in groups, "many of his disciples went back and walked no more with him". Two years of preaching, praying, curing and labouring; two years of suffering, tenderness and charity had it taken to gather these souls around Him. Stop them, Lord! Call them back, O Christ! Tell them they have misunderstood your words. Tell them you only used these strong, hard sayings to impress on them the absolute necessity of having faith in the doctrines you brought from your Father's Bosom! O Truth Incarnate, let them not walk to eternal destruction, but give an explanation that will remove from their minds the persuasion they find so intolerable!

But Christ Our Lord has no correction to make, no explanation to impart. Turning to His Chosen Twelve, He tries their faith in the fire: "Will you also go away?" Go if you will. The price to remain is unwavering faith in the promise I have spoken: one day you will eat my real flesh and drink the blood that courses through my veins. Peter, big-hearted, lovable Peter falls on his knees and exclaims for all: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life". We know not, Lord, how this thing shall be done, but "we have believed and have known that thou art the Christ, the Son of God". And Peter remained, and with him remains the holy Catholic Church daily protesting: Lord, I believe; O Mystery of Faith!

Twelve months have passed since that memorable day at Capharnaum. Twelve months of expectation in the minds of the Apostles; twelve months of growing doubt in the impure heart of Judas. Time has hurried Jesus on to the consummation of divine abasement in quest of man. We see Him in the midst of his Apostles, seated at supper on the night of His betrayal. With a great and burning desire had he desired to eat this pasch with His disciples. This was the blessed night chosen for the fulfilment of the great promise; the night that should end the perplexity of the Twelve; the night that should give the simple answer to the maddening "How, how, O Lord" that beat incessantly in their minds since that unhappy day in Capharnaum.

Into His sacred hands Jesus takes the bread. He blesses it, breaks it, and gives it to them, saying: "Take and eat all ye of this: this is my Body". And likewise with the chalice: "Take and drink all ye of this, for this is the chalice of my Blood, of the new and eternal testament, which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins". The disciples take with trembling hands and eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ the Son of God made man. In that moment He held Himself in His own hands. He who holds the universe in the might of His arm became in that moment the life-giving food of the souls of men. O Mystery of Faith! O wondrous gift of boundless goodness, given only to man: that the humble and poor servant should nourish his soul with the life of God!

This, then, was the way. By His omnipotent power He had changed the water into wine at the wedding-feast in Cana of Galilee. By that same power He had drawn all things from the abyss of nothingness and clothed them with being. By that same omnipotence Christ changed the bread into His own Body, the wine into His precious Blood. Who shall doubt the God of truth when He announces to men this fact of His omnipotence? Who shall now murmur: "This saying is hard; and who can hear it"? To deny the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist one must deny the existence of the God of Truth. For, what sort of monster would that god be who would lead endless generations of men to embrace a crust of bread with trembling hands whilst with loving lips they adoringly say: "My Lord and my God"?

One day it was reported to Simon de Montfort that people were seeing in the Sacred Host exposed on the altar the Infant Jesus, radiating light and blessing the adoring worshippers. "I do not need to go to see that", said this great lover of the Blessed Eucharist, "My faith is firmly founded on the word of Eternal Truth Who said to us: 'This is

my Body; this is my Blood'." Let us stir up our faith in this Mystery of Faith. Let us make It the centre of our lives, the foundation of our hopes, the source of our sanctity.

"O Sacred Banquet in which Christ is received;
In which the memory of His Passion is ever renewed;
In which the soul is filled with grace,
And the pledge of future glory is given to us".

THOMAS MULDOON.

Notes

In the thirty-third Elucidation of his *Mysterium Fidei*, Fr. de la Taille discusses the intricate question of the validity of Mass offered by a priest who has been separated from the Church by public excommuni-

ON THE VALIDITY OF THE OFFERING OF THE MASS BY A PRIEST SEPARATED FROM THE CHURCH.

cation, notorious heresy or complete schism, and also of that offered by a priest who, while still remaining in the Church, has been deprived of office and status. The common opinion is that such an offering is valid, and the doctrine is said to be certain. The difficulty of the question arises from the fact that there must be some union with the Church for the offering of the ministerial offerer to be valid. In all the cases under consideration the ordination is supposed valid, for Fr. de la Taille is considering only the offering of real priests legitimately ordained within the Church. How can the priest who is separated from the Church in any of the ways mentioned above, offer in the name of the Church? or, if he is not separated from the Church, how can he offer in her name when he is expressly forbidden by her to do so?

The validity cannot come from a new formal act of offering in the will of Christ, for, as was shown in Elucidation 23, there is no new formal offering by Christ, and no new act of the will ratifying the ministerial offering. On the part of Christ there is only a virtual offering which accompanies each valid offering of the Mass. The term "virtual offering", of which Fr. de la Taille makes use on p. 396, perhaps needs a note of explanation. The meaning is not that Christ has merely a virtual intention with regard to the offering of the ministerial priest, but that the offering of that priest, made in conformity with the command of Christ, "Do this in commemoration of me", is absorbed into the eternal offering which Christ makes in heaven, where, ever present as priest and victim, there is a perpetual complacency of his will in the acceptance by God of his completed sacrifice. This complacency of the will of Christ is formal, but it is not a formal act of offering, for the offering has been made once and for all, and has been finally and eternally accepted; yet it has the virtuality of an offering, for if the sacrifice were not yet made this attitude of the will of Christ would be an offering of it. The perpetual presence of Christ as priest and victim before God, and

His perpetual acceptance of Christ the Victim is an offering persevering in *facto esse*. The full reality of priesthood and victimhood persevere in the state of acceptance on the part of God and of complacency on the part of the will of Christ.

Fr. de la Taille's approach to his solution by an examination of the Fathers and early theologians cited in chronological sequences does not lessen the difficulty. With a good number of the authorities he quotes it is difficult to decide whether the authors are supposing that the orders of the priest in question are valid; and even where that question is settled, it is not always clear that the writers are speaking of the validity of the offering of the Mass, since they often state merely that the offering is not pleasing to God, is unclean, is not a true offering, which may quite easily mean, and probably does mean in some cases, that the personal offering of the offerer who is in a state of sin is not pleasing to God. It does not seem to be too much to say that almost all of the Fathers cited can be interpreted as at least not clearly denying the validity of the sacrifice offered under the circumstances being considered. At least there is not a consensus of the Fathers in a sense contrary to the opinion held to-day as common and certain.

When he comes to the medieval theologians Fr. de la Taille quotes twenty-one authors from Guido of Arezzo (1050) to Innocent III (1216); and these seem about equally divided in affirming and denying the validity of the offering. Some, like Peter Lombard, make a distinction. Lombard is not consistent, but his final view appears to be that the Mass of a deposed priest is invalid, while that of a heretic is valid. The clearest answer given is that of Algerus (1130), who says: "Seeing therefore that all the sacraments of the Lord without exception are from the Catholic Church, even among the heretics, who are united with the Church in so far as they celebrate with due rite, it is beyond question that the sacrament of the divine sacrifice, wherever offered, is within the Church, since it is of the Church".

This is the solution accepted by the great Scholastic Doctors, Albert the Great, Thomas and Bonaventure, and it affirms what is the common opinion to-day; but it leaves the further interesting and important question to be answered: How are these sacrifices of the Church? Can the Church disown them? Can the Church be forced to offer through a minister of whom she expressly disapproves? In the answer to these questions we find the full and complete solution to the original problem; and the answer is this: The priest who is validly ordained, by

virtue of the priestly character, has from the Church a power which he can always use validly, and which the Church cannot withdraw from him.

All that is required for a valid offering on the part of one who is validly ordained and is using the due rite, is that he should desire to use his priestly power. This power is vested in the character, which is indelible and indestructible. Provided then, that his prevailing intention be to exercise that power, no matter what may be his personal disposition towards the Church, no matter what personal sin he may be guilty of even in the act of offering, the priest who is separated from or silenced by the Church can, in defiance of the Church, force her to ratify his offering and so validly offer that sacrifice which, in the words of the Council of Trent, is "that clean oblation, which cannot be defiled by any unworthiness or malice of those that offer it" (Sess. 22, c. 1).

This solution differs slightly from that of Fr. de la Taille at least to the extent of regarding as unnecessary the distinction introduced by him on p. 427, in the following words: "So much for what the heretic can do in this matter. If, however, you ask what he does do in any particular case, the answer is not necessarily the same. For though the Church will never fail her legate, her legate may fail the Church, being unwilling to act for the Church, in her name, his predominant intention being simply and absolutely to act for himself only, or, what is much more probable, to act as minister for a false sect". In the opinion of the present writer, as will be evident from what is written above, the intention of the priest will suffice for a valid offering of the Mass if his intention be to use the power of the priesthood, which is inherent in the priestly character. If he has this intention he offers, willy nilly, in the name of the Church, for he offers by a power received from the Church. If his disposition towards the Church be such that he would rather forego the offering of the Mass than offer in the name of the Church, he has not the intention of using the power received from the Church, and consequently does not offer validly.

This view seems to be a logical development of the doctrine of the character as taught by St. Thomas. The power over the Eucharistic Body is given by the character which, in the opinion of St. Thomas, and in the more common opinion of theologians to-day, is a spiritual power residing in the faculties of the soul as in its subject. This power is referred "to the sacraments and to the things which pertain to divine worship" (Summa q. 63, a. 5); and has special reference to the Euch-

arist. The priestly character impressed in the sacrament of Order is the spiritual power of validly consecrating the Eucharist. This character is indelible, as Trent defined. Therefore the validity of the use of this power whenever due rites are observed is beyond question. The heretical or silenced priest can observe the due rites; and if he does so with the intention of using his spiritual power, his offering will be the offering of one eternally sealed as the minister of the Church. Consequently, where the other conditions for validity are present, his offering will be valid, irrespective of his unsuitability and unacceptability as a minister.

The subordinate question of the fruit of the Mass discussed by de la Taille in the same Elucidation is solved, as he notes, by application of the same principle; and nothing need be added on that head to what is written in the *Mysterium Fidei*.

In this short article use has been made of Fr. Carroll's translation into English of the thirty-third Elucidation, which the writer has been privileged to see in manuscript. It is to be hoped that this portion of the English rendering of the *Mysterium Fidei* will soon be added to what has already appeared, and that before long the whole work will have been completed to the satisfaction and help of many readers.

J. S. KELLY, S.J.

Book Reviews

EVOLUTION AND PHILOSOPHY. G. H. Duggan, S.M. A. H. and A. W. Reed, Wellington, N.Z. 227 pages. Price, 12/6.

Our copy of Father Duggan's book did not reach us in time for a review in our last issue. Meanwhile it has been selling so well that we need only commend it and recommend it.

A scientific theory, whether true or false, must at least fit in with truths already established. A theory of animal evolution must not contradict the established truths of philosophy. Many evolutionary theories either assume a false account of Reality or, going beyond the observed facts of science, announce crude and false theories about the nature and origin of life. Accordingly Father Duggan, in his book, 'Evolution and Philosophy', before trying to arrive at conclusions that may be logically drawn from the facts of science, outlines and discusses various accounts of Reality which evolutionists have assumed or adopted. He then briefly demonstrates the principles of Moderate Realism, especially on the Origin of Life. Next he passes to give judgment on the principal theories of evolutionists, collates them with the known facts, and seeks to arrive at same conclusions justified by the evidence. For this purpose Father Duggan has made himself familiar with most of the literature on the subject, including recent works.

Father Duggan aims at filling a double role. He writes as philosopher and as scientist. It is too much to expect that the great problems involved can be adequately discussed in 227 pages, and omissions are not defects so much as abbreviations forced on him by limitations of space. When philosophical opinions come up for discussion there is room for difference of opinion as to the amount of space to be allotted to each. It is rather a surprise to find Hume and Kant disposed of in two pages in which the reader is referred to scholastic textbooks, while Bergson has half a dozen pages. Hegel gets a more reasonable ration. Father Duggan gives only a superficial account of Moderate Realism. His Treatment of the 'Five Ways' is not intended for professional philosophers but is adequate for his purpose. One omission seems rather serious. There is no careful examination of the Principle of Causality. This principle is fundamental in any sane theory of evolution. The denial of it—apparently through misunderstanding it—makes possible the current theory of Emergent Evolution which Father Duggan does not examine in any detail. At the 1943 Catholic Congress of Science

held in Edinburgh Professor Whittaker was bold enough to say: "A careful analysis, by the aid of the new science of quantum mechanics, of certain phenomena in atomic physics, had shown *conclusively* that the *postulate* of causality is not universally valid". (Italics ours). Father Aelred Whitacre, O.P., replied with an admirable discussion of the principle, with special relation to modern scientific advances. (See 'The Month', March-April and July-August, 1944). The whole discussion is of primary importance in the philosophy of evolution. We think Father Duggan, in the later editions which will certainly be called for, might give more space to the principle. It is not a 'postulate' but, as Father Duggan says, a 'self-evident truth'. It is an application of the Principle of Sufficient Reason. This principle supposes that the Reality is rational, a truth that not all evolutionists are disposed to accept.

Father Duggan devotes the second part of his book to a discussion on the Origin of Life. For the philosopher this problem is the most important in the evolutionary discussion. Only 35 pages are given to the problem and to the criticism of various views. But the discussion is adequate and a model of close reasoning. The examination of the data shows that there is no explanation of known facts which does not admit a divine intervention at three stages in the evolution of Being. When this truth is established there remains room for great divergence of opinion as to the nature and extent of this intervention by the Creator.

The remaining 150 pages are devoted by Father Duggan to a logical analysis of the facts which various sciences contribute as the basis of a theory of Evolution. For many readers these will be the most interesting pages of the book; but Father Duggan would be anything but pleased if attention was centred on these pages to the neglect of the less interesting but more important sections that have preceded. On this third and most instructive section we would make only two criticisms. Lloyd Morgan and Emergent Evolution seem deserving of more consideration than they receive. An injection of sound philosophy would make this theory attractive. Indeed, if it were read in conjunction with Darwin's final paragraph in the 'Origin of Species' it would provide a theory congruent to the philosophy of Moderate Realism. The second remark we should like to make is that a philosopher is often annoyed by a 'circle', vicious or not, which seems to be found in many discussions on evolution. The zoologist, when making out a line of descent, generally assumes that geologists have given a final statement of the order of strata. But the geologist makes much use of the type of animal fossils

that are found, in order to decide the age of different strata. Father Duggan might devote a page to this apparent fallacy, of which some scientists are beginning to show themselves aware.

Father Duggan's own scientific conclusions are briefly stated towards the close of the volume. He accepts the *a priori* probability of the doctrine that acquired characteristics can be transmitted. Cell theory seems to give no support to such probability, and, as far as the present writer is aware, there is no clear *a posteriori* evidence in its favour. Father Duggan makes it plain that there is no satisfactory theory of evolution which explains the facts by any one factor of change. Many factors have, in all probability, contributed to development as we know it. He accepts Evolution as a fact, but wisely concludes: 'As the evidence stands at present the only probable hypothesis is some form of Moderate Evolution'. The reader who follows his argument will, we think, accept this view. It allows for a change of hypothesis in face of possible future evidence. It allows for a reconsideration of the evidence which may be forced on us when the developing science of atomic physics extends its ambit to include not only inorganic matter, but also organic and living things.

W.K.

*

*

*

*

DE UNIONE SACERDOTIS CUM CHRISTO SACERDOTE ET VICTIMA. Fr. R. Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P. pp. 160. Marietti.

The fulness of our priestly life cannot be attained without an understanding of the nature and purpose of the Priesthood; and there is always room for further enlightenment and consequently more perfect intention in the fulfilment of our sacerdotal duties. The book under notice, by the well known Dominican, whose authorship is sufficient guarantee of its deep doctrine and true devotion, can be recommended in all earnestness. Following the teachings of St. Thomas and not neglecting the Fathers or more recent Saints who have in their lives exemplified what they wrote on the Priesthood, the author brings out with clarity the meaning of the character of the Priesthood and the sacramental grace of Holy Orders. The former, he says, is given for the validity of the priestly actions, and is not capable of increase; the latter as a mode of sanctifying grace is given *ad sancte et semper sanctius celebrandum et absolvendum*. It increases with sanctifying grace, and gives a right to more and more actual graces for the holy exercise of

sacerdotal functions until death; so that the priest's last Mass, though celebrated perhaps with less sensible fervour than his first, is nevertheless offered with a greater degree of holiness. The great High Priest is Christ, Who is at the same time the Victim of the Sacrifice, which we offer as free and conscious instruments. We should be associated with Him not merely as offerers but also as victims, offering our daily sufferings, united to the sufferings of His Passion. The priestly life is supernatural, and other than in the offering of the Sacrifice, it exercises itself in producing supernatural effects, especially by the ministry of preaching, absolving from sin and directing souls to God their last end. The notion of the *finis ultimus* or the final cause of the Priesthood, which, among the causes, is first in intention though last in execution, runs right through the book and puts in its proper perspective the mission of Christ which is continued by the exercise of the Priesthood. As we would expect, Fr. Garrigou-Lagrange clearly proves his principles, but not content with that, he descends to practical guidance for the more worthy celebration of Mass, for more efficacious preaching and a better discharge of the offices of spiritual father, teacher, physician, and judge in the sacrament of Penance.

Perhaps some one will eventually undertake to publish this work in an English version, but the Latin is clear and the labour of a close reading with reflection will be well repaid by a deeper appreciation of the reason why one is a Priest—not to preach and propagate a false system of temporal happiness and prosperity as man's destiny, but to work for the eternal salvation of immortal souls, that they may have life and have it more abundantly.

J.M.

*

*

*

*

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS, vol. II. Precepts. By Canon E.

J. Mahoney, D.D. Burns, Oates and Washbourne Ltd. 18/- stg.

Canon Mahoney has long been recognised by the English Clergy and by many others in the English-speaking world as a leading authority on Moral Theology, Canon Law and kindred matters. His *Answers* over a long period in the *Clergy Review* have been a standard of practical guidance in many a difficult situation. The volume lately to hand is the companion to one published in 1946, which contained questions concerning the Sacraments. Here we have carefully revised and arrang-

ed according to subject matter the answers on points of Law, divine and ecclesiastical, and in particular the Church's legislation as it concerns the Clergy and Religious. The book is a mine of accurate information on matters of Moral Theology, Canon Law and Liturgy. At the beginning of each *Answer*, where there is a pertinent declaration of ecclesiastical Authority, it is given as the basis of the explanations which follow. A practical conclusion is worked out in every instance. The book is a compilation of *Answers* given in the *Clergy Review*, and so they have a live interest. The information is given clearly and with a remarkable brevity, considering the complicated nature of some of the matter treated. An occasional flash of quiet humour enlivens what could easily become a series of 'dry as bones' replies to equally uninteresting professional queries. The priest on the Australian Mission would find this book a friend in need to solve a doubt.

J.M.

*

*

*

*

RUFINUS OF AQUILEIA (345-411). His Life and Works. A Dissertation by Francis X. Murphy, C.S.S.R., Ph.D. Cath. Uni. Washington (U.S.A.).

This more than usually interesting dissertation does a good deal to clear the name of Rufinus from the charges levelled against him, and to re-establish him in his rightful position as one of the important influences in the Catholic life of the fifth century. His industry, skill and honesty as a translator are well presented, and the extraordinary reserve which he showed in the face of the often ill-informed and always over-vehement attacks of St. Jerome marks him as a man who not only preached but also practised true asceticism.

Further research into the chronology of the life of Rufinus will probably lead to the gradual reduction of the number of incidents which are at present dated only conjecturally. A more detailed study of the influence exerted by the translations of Rufinus on the development of the monastic system in the West could be welcomed by many. The careful analysis of the *Apologia contra Hieronymum* (pp. 138-148) would of itself suffice to restore to Rufinus a good deal of the respect which has been withheld so long.

While the matter is interesting and on the whole well arranged, there are a number of unnecessary repetitions of quotations and phrases; but a more serious defect is the intrusion of colloquial Americanisms into

the narrative. For instance on p. xii of the introduction we read: "men whose say-so is at least more dis-interested than that of St. Jerome". Expressions such as "show down" (p. 133), "stop off" (in many places) and others, are out of keeping with the dignity of the narrative. These lapses are particularly unwelcome in translation; yet we find on p. 34 Paulinus of Nola translated as saying of Melania: "in short order she became a mother"; and on p. 220 St. Jerome is represented as saying to Parrachius: "You must pass up, with a deaf ear, the Scyllean dogs". In this same quotation we have the phrase: "trodding them under heel". When the author speaks on p. 176 of a "historical problem of considerable intrigue" we need not think of cloak and dagger, but of interest or intricacy. There is a puzzling inconsistency in the spelling of the word "Pope" sometimes with a capital letter, and sometimes without.

In spite of the author's disclaimer (p. 226) a fair delineation of the man Rufinus emerges from the work, and it is the delineation of a personality worthy of respect and affection.

J.S.K.

*

*

*

*

PRAELECTIONES BIBLICAE, VETUS TESTAMENTUM, I, Simon-Prado C.S.S.R. Marietti, Turin and Rome, 1949 (Editio quinta et sexta retractata). XVI + 714 and map.

The solid Biblical manual of Simon and Prado, who continued the work of Fr. Simon, has been frequently mentioned in the *A.C.R.* Simon's two volumes on the New Testament have won wide popularity in the class room. They are sound, sane and packed with erudition. They were really mines to be explored, and priests who have continued to use them always find matters of interest in them for information and, above all, for preaching. The footnotes, illustrating the text, were drawn from the finest Scriptural scholars, and quoted, with great care, in the original language. Simon's Latin was rather obscure and difficult for beginners, and his method of compressing much into a small space caused his pages frequently to have the appearance of those illustrating a chess problem. Simon was most conservative, and rather unfair to the more liberal school among the Catholics. The volumes devoted to the Old Testament are mainly the work of Fr. Prado, and he has successfully imitated the method and style of Simon. Of course it is impossible to give the Old Testament the same detailed treatment that the books of the New Testament received. In the first volume before us,

Prado has dealt with the historical books of the Old Testament. One notes with pleasure that, following upon recent Papal documents seeking charity among Biblical scholars, that the theories of the liberal Catholic school are rejected, generally, but in moderate terms. While it is only right and healthy that Catholic scholars should by every scientific means possible strive to test the current doctrines on doubtful points, it is also most correct that the current doctrines should be defended with energy and ability until they are proved false, and are so regarded by the Church. Hence liberty with respect, defence of the traditional view with comprehension and understanding of the scientific advance is the ideal. This method Fr. Prado has adopted in his chapters on the Six Days, the origin of man, the Fall, the Flood, the Deutero-Isaiah and the Book of Jonas. For instance, to take the old question of the historicity of the Book of Jonas, which is a sample of the fair and careful treatment of a difficult and debated question by the author. First Prado gives an analysis of this surprising book; he then, with lengthy quotations, gives the arguments of those Catholics who call into question the historicity of the narrative; for the historicity he quotes then the following arguments amongst others: the words of Christ (Mt. 12, 40-41, etc.); Jewish tradition; the almost unanimous interpretation of the Fathers; inefficacy of arguments against historicity. So the question is treated in a most fair and scientific manner. Hence the book is a first-class manual; it is packed with facts, so that it is almost a little encyclopaedia. A very detailed index helps very much in the consultation of the book.

T.V.

*

*

*

*

THE ESCHATOLOGY OF SAINT JEROME. A Dissertation by
John P. O'Connell, Mundelein Seminary, Illinois (U.S.A.).

This is a model dissertation. The interest of the reader is certain to be captured and held, both because of the matter treated, and because of the author studied. Fr. O'Connell has a sure knowledge of the problems of Eschatology; and this leads to a precise and lucid examination of the bearing of many passages in the writings of St. Jerome, which might otherwise be read out of focus. Enthusiasm for the author or the topic is never allowed to interfere with the impartial and scholarly analysis of the texts discussed; and the whole dissertation is written in readable prose. The work is useful not only as a study of St. Jerome,

but also as a guide to the interpretation of the writings of his contemporaries.

Unfortunately Rufinus is taken at Jerome's valuation. It can be doubted whether it is fair to him to say that he attempted to "portray Jerome as an unqualified supporter of Origen" (p. 40); or to imply, as the context of this passage seems to imply, that Rufinus was not following the lead of Jerome in his mode of translation.

There is, perhaps, a slight oversight where, on p. 107, Fr. O'Connell writes: "There is no evidence in his works that he considered the vision the essential element of heavenly happiness —" and in the next sentence: "Since Jerome does not consider the vision of God the essential element. . . ."; for it seems that the evidence is not compelling one way or the other.

In the text on p. 115 we read: "The soul of Nepotian has returned to Christ"; and this does not seem to represent accurately the text of Jerome on which it is based, and which is quoted in the foot-note: "Corpus terra suscepit, anima Christo reddita est".

Fr. O'Connell wisely excludes from the body of his dissertation the discussion of the possible Pelagian tendency of the passages quoted on pp. 126, 127; but he is a little hard on Jerome when he says in the foot-note: "An orthodox interpretation of these passages is not impossible"; for, after all, an orthodox interpretation is even easy, though the expression by Jerome is loose.

The outline of mercyism (pp. ix, x) is very useful; (Those who do not thank Fr. O'Connell for coining the word should at least refrain from blaming him); and the study of the relevant texts of Jerome (pp. 156-176) is clear and enlightening.

The whole dissertation can be recommended without reserve to all who are interested in either Jerome or Eschatology.

J.S.K.

*

*

*

*

KNOCKNAGOW; OR, THE HOMES OF TIPPERARY. By Charles J. Kickham. Gill and Son Ltd., Dublin. Price, 7/6.

Although sixty-seven eventful years have come and gone since the old Fenian of '67 was laid to rest "beside the Anner at the foot of Slievenamon", his name is still a household word and his memory in benediction throughout the length and breadth of his native land. Indeed, in one respect at least, Charles Kickham can never 'wholly die'. Poet, novelist, and patriot, he has many titles to lasting and grateful

recognition, but beyond question it is as the author of *Knocknagow* he is best and most affectionately remembered.

A book of deep and abiding interest and indeed considered by many and discerning critics as the greatest Irish novel of all time, *Knocknagow* is now republished in a cheap and attractive edition, its value greatly enhanced by the addition of a very readable sketch of the author's life and works from the pen of the late Father Matthew Russell, S.J. Readers will find it a simple story, well told, in which joy and sorrow, humour and pathos, are delightfully and harmoniously blended. Many of the scenes depicted are no doubt records of the author's own experiences. The characters, too (and what charming personalities they are!) are from real life—men and women among whom he lived and moved, whose epic struggle on the road to nationhood makes, when told with sympathy and understanding and a touch of that kindly humour that makes the whole world kin, one of the greatest tales of peasant life ever written. Possessing as he did a thorough insight into those springs of action by which men and women are actuated in all their varying moods, it is not surprising that throughout all Kickham's works there runs like a thread of gold the soothing and elevating influence of religion. Gilding everything that to outward appearances looks drab and commonplace, illuminating the darkest night, is always the simple Irish faith, the lamp of hope and encouragement 'amid the encircling gloom'. How different the clerical characters in Kickham from those, say, in William Carleton, which are mere burlesques by comparison! Father Hannigan, of *Knocknagow*, impresses one immediately as the ideal parish priest, the true soggart aroon, and a worthy counterpart of Canon Sheehan's immortal Father Dan and Dr. Gray.

Unfortunately space will not permit of more than a passing glance at some of the more notable personalities that give life and colour to this most delightful of Irish novels. First of all there is Mat Donovan, universally known as Mat the Thrasher, who excelled in all kinds of work as a farm labourer, and never met his match at wielding a flail or throwing the sledge. Then there is the unforgettable Phil Lahy, a tailor by profession but a born philosopher, whose keen study of Columbeille's prophecies and American newspapers made him the recognised authority in the village on all the great questions of the day. True he exhibited at times a rather regrettable dependence on what he called 'a little nourishment', but then who ever heard of a really great character without a weakness or foible of some kind? Equally pleasant and entertaining company are Bessie Morris and Mary Kearney, two of nature's

ladies; poor Norah Lahy, an angel in human disguise, whom Kickham had to let die in spite of the tearful entreaties of his young nieces; the inimitable Wattletoes who was always up to some harmless mischief; Barney Brodderick, the possessor of an irrepressible wit and the two ugliest feet in the county; and last, but not least, little Tommy Lahy, who told the Bishop, with more truth than he was given credit for, that matrimony is a place or state of punishment where some souls suffer for a time before they go to heaven.

As a welcome, wholesome change from the morbid productions of far too many latter-day novelists we recommend with the fullest confidence, *Knocknagow*; or, *The Homes of Tipperary*, and trust that it will continue to be as popular in the future as it has been in the past.

R.W.

*

*

*

*

DOCTOR COMMUNIS. Turin, Marietti. pp. 181. 1948.

Ever since 1934 the Acta of the Pontifical Academy of St. Thomas have appeared yearly. In 1948 it was decided to publish instead a periodical three times a year, and this has been given the name of Doctor Communis; St. Thomas is honoured as the common source of inspiration in matters philosophical, juridical, and theological. The first number of this excellent publication contains articles by such well-known scholars as Garrigou-Lagrange, Boyer and Parente; it gives also an account of the sessions of the Academy, a survey of current reviews, and notes on recent books. This new periodical is highly recommended; it may be had from Marietti, Turin, and the price of each number is 400 lire.

F.A.M.

*

*

*

*

THE DIVINE CRUCIBLE, by Mother Mary of St. Austin.
(Burns Oates; 182 pp.)

Under this heading have been gathered the thoughtful papers of a Mistress of Novices, a member of the Congregation in England known as *Helpers of the Holy Souls*. After her death, Rev. Nicholas Ryan, S.J., carefully revised and edited her writings, thus giving us a valuable and unusual book. Its author speaks of its contents as "musings or meditations on Purgatory". Happily the description is not quite accurate. Two parallel lines of thought run through the book: the purification of the souls in Purgatory and the work that suf-

fering does for us in this life. She quotes Fr. Rickaby, S.J., in his preface to the *Life of St. Margaret Mary*: "The mystic has his Purgatory here. Few souls are brave enough to endure that....". Mother St. Austin, in her writings, seems to have had in mind Our Lord's words to St. Margaret Mary as He showed her His Sacred Heart: "This is the divine Purgatory of My Love in which you must be purified; I will afterwards make you find in it an abode of light, and finally of union and transformation".

We do not need to be thinking about the mystery of Purgatory to be deeply moved by countless passages in this book. In the chapter entitled "Cleansed by the Attributes of God", we read: "Only when the Sacred Image has penetrated the very depths of the passive soul will the soul be capable of entering into the height of Christ's glory. The knowledge of God and of His attributes only comes to us through the Crucified, and through the purgatorial silences which His Passion makes in the soul". The author returns often to the positive and cleansing power of silence even in this life. (It must be because of its power in building a serene personality, that the enemy of all good is arranging that there is less and less of it among our distracted fellow-men.)

Throughout this book you feel that the writer has been away on the far, clear hills of prayer, and has come back to give us a terse résumé of the wonders she has seen. Perhaps that is the best way to write about these wonders: "The possession of God is the silence of the heart. The thought of God is the silence of the mind. For silence is not an emptiness but a plenitude; it is not the cessation of thought but the fullness of activity.....The wounds of Christ are the gates of God's silences. For all souls—both in this world and in the next—these wounds are the portals by which go in and out the sources of life ever more abundantly...."

As for the verses that appear occasionally through the book, many people will agree that they could have been spared. Not all mystics have the poetic gift of St. John of the Cross. The things Mother St. Austin has to say are so noble that their very saying has in prose a dignity more appealing than any ornamental verse might provide. Take at random the paragraph: "The purified soul, separated from all but the Divine Purity, has then no impulse but the love of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost; has no will but Theirs. She lives in their society; their Being is the source of her own...."

We recommend this book to anyone feeling the need of a holiday

from training that poor recalcitrant soul. It is good for us to escape at times to the hills of adoration where God says to the spirit: "Be still, and see that I am God!"

M.O.

*

*

*

*

JUSTICE FOR THE WORKER—THE CATHOLIC CONTRIBUTION, by Colin Beckett. Catholic Social Guild, Melbourne, 1948—p. 111. Price, 2/6.

Christians have always had to explain their teaching and variously to defend their Church's attitude. This, however, is just as we should expect. For, if Christ Himself was often misunderstood, ignored or misrepresented, then why not the Church, which is the continuation of Christ in time? In that light, the appearance of apologetic works like Mr. Beckett's *Justice for the Worker* is intelligible.

As the subtitle suggests, the author's purpose is to provide an "outline" answer to that annoying taunt—"But the Church has never done anything for the worker". Let critics consider this outline before making a judgment about the Church's concern for the interests of the worker.

Mr. Beckett sketches briefly the historical origins of the social problem which has been the object, in spite of opposition, of Christian teaching and action during the past century. He takes in turn the essential rights of freedom, property, combination and justice, and, in each case, cites examples of Catholic effort in the Middle Ages and during the last century.

Though the substance of the work is good and the authorities well-selected, the outline is not always easy to see. In this connection a table of contents would have helped, and a simple index would not be out of place.

But as it stands, apart from the fact that it provides individuals with a fairly thorough, written answer to the taunt already mentioned, this little work can do good work as a source in discussion groups, especially in those of the workers.

N.T.